

*Leave of Absence**Friday, April 11, 2003***HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES***Friday, April 11, 2003*

The House met at 1.30 p.m.

PRAYERS[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]**LEAVE OF ABSENCE**

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members, I have received written communication for leave of absence from the hon. Member for Arima, Hon. Penelope Beckles, for two weeks starting from today's sitting. The leave of absence which the Member seeks is granted. The hon. Prime Minister, Member for San Fernando East, Hon. Patrick Manning has asked for leave of absence from today's sitting. That leave is granted.

PRIVILEGE RULING BY THE CHAIR

Mr. Speaker: Hon Members, on March 28, 2003, the Member for Diego Martin Central and Leader of the House raised in this House, a matter that he considers directly concerns the privileges of the House. The matter concerns an article appearing in the *Express* of Monday, March 24, 2003, on page 9, under the headline "Ramnath calls PNM MPs 'fools'".

The relevant extract of the article referred to reads, and I quote:

"Couva South MP Kelvin Ramnath has described both the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Barry Sinanan and the Deputy Speaker, Hedwige Bereaux as 'fools'...

he said that the Opposition would not be able to settle the controversial Caroni restructuring plan of the Government in Parliament because the Speaker and Deputy Speaker were fools."

The Member for Diego Martin Central stated that the article linked the disparaging remarks allegedly made by a Member of this House, to a decision of the Chair on March 07, 2003 not to grant permission to the Member for Couva South to raise a matter in this House as a definite matter of urgent public importance.

The effectiveness and dignity of any institution rests on the extent to which it adheres to standards of discipline, decorum and self respect in the discharging of its duties. This is particularly so of the Parliament, the institution of the State which embodies the will of the people. Discipline must flow from inside this House. All here are honourable Members and it is our individual and collective duty to uphold the principles and enhance the dignity of this House and of our Parliament.

Privilege Ruling By The Chair
[MR. SPEAKER]

Friday, April 11, 2003

The Chair of this House is expected to be impartial and judicious and to regulate the proceedings of the House in a way that is in keeping with the highest traditions of this noble institution. To help him accomplish this, there are rules and practices formulated and accepted by this very House and set out, for the most part, in the Standing Orders. It may be that these rules are considered irrelevant by some and unduly restrictive by others, but hon. Members, they are rules of this House and until changed by this House, all Members, including the Chair, are obligated to abide by them.

It is well established in the rules and practice of Parliament that criticisms of rulings given by the Chair, directly or indirectly, whether inside or outside of the House, amount to an attack on the House as a whole, and contempt of the House. The House has devised a simple method of raising concerns related to rulings from the Chair, in recognition of the fact that Members must have an avenue to challenge decisions of the Chair which they feel amount to a trampling of their rights as Members.

Even so, hon. Members, Speakers' rulings both here and abroad are occasionally publicly criticized by courageous and outspoken Members of Parliament. Many of these do not warrant serious notice and are therefore regularly ignored. Interestingly though, genuine criticisms over the course of time have led to in-depth examinations of the rules of procedures in many jurisdictions. On the other hand, criticisms which amount to nothing more than attempts to denigrate and/or intimidate the Chair of a House do receive the serious attention of that House.

Hon. Members, I now return to the matter raised by the Member for Diego Martin Central. In my opinion, the Member's concerns centre around the form and manner of an alleged criticism of a ruling made by the Chair of this House. I have carefully considered this matter and having regard to the facts presented to me and established parliamentary procedure, I am satisfied that *prima facie*, a case of breach of privilege has indeed been made.

Accordingly, I refer this matter to the Committee of Privileges for its consideration. I so rule.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

The Minister of Trade and Industry and Minister in the Ministry of Finance (Hon. Kenneth Valley): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform this honourable House, that today, the Government will answer all oral questions on the Order Paper. Questions Nos. 76, 77, 78, 79, 82 and 86 have been filed with the Clerk of the House for written response.

Mr. G. Singh: Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate with respect to what the Leader of Government Business has said that only 6 out of 22 questions for written answer are due today. Therefore, 16 written answers to questions have not been answered by the Government. They are due for answer by today. Some date back to February. One would hope that the Government does not continue to treat these questions with that kind of contempt.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

WASA

(Short Term Investment Programme)

53. Mr. Ganga Singh (*Caroni East*) asked the Minister of Public Utilities and the Environment to indicate the source and amount of funding for WASA's Short Term Investment Programme undertaken in the year 2002?

The Minister of Public Utilities and the Environment (Sen. The Hon. Rennie Dumas): Mr. Speaker, WASA has advised that the cost of the programme of works undertaken by WASA under the Short Term Investment Programme in 2002, amounted to \$52,239,298 which was funded in the sum of \$50 million from funds made available under the North Water Project and \$4,239,298 from WASA's operating fund.

Mr. Singh: Could the hon. Minister indicate where exactly from the North Water Project was this \$50 million taken?

Sen. The Hon. R. Dumas: Under the general funding. I would not be able to indicate that there was any specific withdrawal from any specific project.

Mr. Singh: I want to indicate to the Minister that perhaps, he should look at the Beetham sewerage plant as to whether or not the \$50 million came from the \$330 million allocated for that.

WASA

(Chief Executive Officer, Mr. Errol Grimes)

54. Mr. Ganga asked the Minister of Public Utilities and the Environment to state whether the salary increase which had been granted to the Chief Executive Officer of WASA, Mr. Errol Grimes, received ministerial approval and, if so, when?

The Minister of Public Utilities and the Environment (Sen. The Hon. Rennie Dumas): Mr. Speaker, ministerial approval was not given for the salary increase which had been granted to the Chief Executive Officer of WASA. In those circumstances, the Government has directed that the Chief Executive Officer and

other senior managers of the authority revert to the previous remuneration packages.

Mr. Singh: Is the Minister making arrangements for the sum that was paid in excess to be garnished? Would the Minister be making arrangements for this sum to be repaid to the State?

Sen. The Hon. R. Dumas: That matter is under consideration and a decision has not yet been made.

Mr. Singh: Consideration by whom, hon. Minister?

Sen. The Hon. R. Dumas: By the Government of Trinidad and Tobago.

Telecommunications Sector

55. Mr. Ganga Singh asked the hon. Minister of Public Administration and Information to inform this House:

- (a) When will full competition be introduced in the telecommunications sector in Trinidad and Tobago?
- (b) When will the Telecommunications Authority be fully functional and operational?

The Minister of Public Administration and Information (Sen. The Hon. Dr. Lenny Saith): Mr. Speaker, full competition in the telecommunication sector in Trinidad and Tobago would be realized only when crucial administrative and infrastructural matters have been completed. The Government is working assiduously on all the issues and wishes to see full competition in the sector within the shortest possible timeframe.

Specific timeframes for the activities that have to be undertaken are as follows:

With regard to additional mobile services, the Government is moving with the greatest urgency towards offering additional mobile services in Trinidad and Tobago. However, this effort was stymied as a result of a flawed election process which was undertaken by the previous UNC administration. It is a matter of public record that in 1999, interested parties were invited to submit applications for licences to provide additional mobile services for Trinidad and Tobago. However, judicial review of the process was sought by an aggrieved party. The matter was heard both in the High Court and the Court of Appeal. Despite the vindication of the High Court decision by the Court of Appeal, the previous administration then appealed to the judicial committee of the Privy Council. After two years delay in

this matter, the appeal was eventually withdrawn by the present administration shortly after resuming office in 2002. A new request for proposal would be issued and the original applicants in 1999 would be invited to upgrade their previous applications. Timeframe for this action is by September 2003.

Spectrum Audit and Management: An audit of the 900, 1800 and 1900 megahertz spectrum band was conducted by foreign technical experts, since these bands are principally reserved for the future expansion of mobile services in Trinidad and Tobago. The final report of the consultant is currently being considered. At the same time, an evaluation committee under the auspices of the Central Tenders Board is presently evaluating tenders from three international firms to develop and implement a modern frequency spectrum management system for the Ministry of Public Administration and Information and the Trinidad and Tobago Telecommunications Authority. Timeframe for this action is by July 31, 2003.

National Broad Band Policy: The technical team comprising representatives of the Ministry of Public Administration and Information, the University of the West Indies, Faculty of Engineering, the Association of Independent Internet Service Providers and Telecommunications Services of Trinidad and Tobago (TSTT) is at the moment working on drafting a national broad band policy. The report is expected by April 30, 2003.

A national broadcast policy taking into account public comments on an original draft has been prepared and would now be finalized in consultation with the respondent to the original draft before being submitted for the consideration of Cabinet. This exercise is expected to be completed by April 30, 2003.

Negotiations with Cable and Wireless West Indies Limited: The issue of expanding the telecommunications services in Trinidad and Tobago by allowing additional providers, especially mobile services, depends entirely on the existence of an inter connection agreement with the dominant service provider, TSTT. Government in addressing this issue of inter connection will reconstitute a team to negotiate with Cable and Wireless Limited, the minority shareholder of TSTT. This team would be set up by June 30, 2003.

Operationalization of the Telecommunications Authority: I wish to point out that liberalization of the sector cannot proceed successfully without the proper institutional and regulatory framework. The first board of the Trinidad and Tobago Telecommunications Authority was appointed on July 25, 2002 and has focused mainly on administrative matters.

Oral Answers to Questions
[SEN. THE HON. DR. L. SAITH]

Friday, April 11, 2003

The board recommended to the ministry, an individual expert to serve as executive director for a period of two years under the terms of the project agreement between the Government of Trinidad and Tobago and the Inter American Development Bank for the modernization of telecommunications in Trinidad and Tobago. An appointment of the executive director is expected by April 2003. This is a major step towards the establishment of the Authority that would become fully operational during the course of this year. In the meantime, the ministry is in the process of determining core regulations to cover a wide range of issues pertinent to regulating the sector. Technical assistance in the formulation of these regulations would be made available to the ministry through resources under the IDB modernization of telecommunications project.

Thank you.

Mr. Singh: Could the hon. Minister indicate what time line with the negotiations for inter connection, the Government has in mind for the end of that negotiation process with Cable and Wireless?

Sen. The Hon. Dr. L. Saith: Mr. Speaker, after the team is set up in June, one of the first issues would be to meet with TSTT to determine the issues that are to be negotiated and set a time frame. I am unable at this time to say what that time frame would be.

The following question stood on the Order Paper in the name of Mr. Ganga Singh (Caroni East):

Carnival 2002/2003
(Allocations and Payments To Organizations)

- 44.** Could the hon. Minister of Culture and Tourism indicate the governmental allocation and payments to:
- (i) National Carnival Commission;
 - (ii) Pan Trinbago;
 - (iii) TUCO for Carnival 2002 and 2003?

The Minister of Trade and Industry and Minister in the Ministry of Finance (Hon. Kenneth Valley): Mr. Speaker, I have to ask for a deferral of question No. 44. The Member is not here. The answer to 44 that I have is a Senate answer.

Mr. Singh: Mr. Speaker, I merely want to indicate to the honourable House, through you, that this question had been deferred on a previous occasion for two weeks which is altogether now five weeks.

Hon. Valley: Mr. Speaker, the Member was ill as the House knows.

Mr. Singh: It is my understanding that there is a junior minister in that particular ministry; that Minister ought to answer.

Question, by leave, deferred.

**DEFINITE URGENT MATTERS
(LEAVE)**

**National Maintenance and Security Training Company
(Lack of Security)**

Mr. Harry Partap (*Nariva*): Mr. Speaker, in accordance with Standing Order 12 of the House of Representatives, I seek your leave to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent, public importance, namely, the lack of security at public institutions as a result of action taken by employees of the National Maintenance Training and Security Company (MTS).

The matter is definite because it refers to a specific issue of a lack of security at major public institutions. The matter is urgent because people are at risk at hospitals, schools and other public buildings.

The matter is of public importance because MTS security officers provide security for thousands of workers at public institutions, including hospitals and schools. Their absence would put these people at risk in light of the escalation of crime in the country.

Mr. Speaker: This is a perfect motion to be brought under Standing Order 11(2). It eminently qualifies under that particular Standing Order. The leave which you seek under Standing Order 12 is refused.

**Forres Park Dump Site
(Toxic Smoke from)**

Dr. Adesh Nanan (*Tabaquite*): Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 12(1) and (2), I hereby seek your leave to move the adjournment of the House in order to discuss a definite matter of urgent, public importance, namely, the danger posed to the health and safety of the residents of the villages of Forres Park, Macualay and Springvale, due to toxic smoke emanating from the Forres Park dump site, situated at Forres Park, Claxton Bay.

The matter is definite because it refers to a specific identifiable failure of the Government and its agent, the Solid Waste Management Company Limited, to take the necessary steps to prevent and/or control fires at the said dump site.

Forres Park Dump Site
[DR. A. NANAN]

Friday, April 11, 2003

The matter is urgent because of the imminent threat to the lives of thousands of residents by the toxic smoke.

The matter is of public importance because the current situation at the dump site is affecting the health of the residents of the surrounding areas and poses a danger to the immediate environment.

Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: The leave for which the hon. Member seeks is denied. May I recommend the hon. Member to use Standing Order 11.

STATEMENT BY MINISTER

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member for Diego Martin Central, you have a statement that you would like to make?

The Minister of Trade and Industry and Minister in the Ministry of Finance (Hon. Kenneth Valley): Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned to the Clerk, I have a statement, but I want it to be deferred to a later time in the session.

Assent indicated.

SUMMARY COURTS (AMDT.) BILL

[THIRD DAY]

Order read for resuming adjourned debate on question [April 04, 2003]

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Question again proposed.

Mr. Speaker: The Member for Laventille East/Morvant was speaking at the time of the adjournment of the House. He spoke for nine minutes and has 36 minutes left of his normal speaking time. I now call on the hon. Member for Laventille East/Morvant.

Mr. F. Hinds (Laventille East/Morvant): Mr. Speaker, the Bill brought by the Government through the hon. Attorney General, in essence, as we would recall, does two things. Firstly, the appellant who wishes to give notice that he is appealing the decision of the magistrate is obliged to do so, in accordance with section 130 of the existing Act. The problem that arose as the Attorney General pointed out was a situation where such appellants would give due notice in due time, but because of the tardiness, for a number of reasons, on the part of the prisons authority, the notice did not get to the Clerk of Appeals on time. When the matter came up for hearing before the Court of Appeal, the court explained in

several cases that it was obliged to follow the law very strictly and could not vary or adjust the time and, as such, the appeal could not be heard.

The Attorney General presented to this honourable House, an amendment to that legislation simply saying, that where the person in custody or the prisoner files his notice of appeal within the seven-day time limit as is expected under the existing Act to the prisons authorities—he could only do so because he is not at liberty to go to the office of the clerk, he is deemed to have submitted it to the Clerk of Appeals for the purposes of complying with legislation.

The second element of this is that there is a validation provision. The Attorney General recognized that there are some matters in the pipeline and these would come up as a problem after we adjust and make the amendments to this legislation. The Attorney General is saying in the Bill as proposed at clause 3 that every notice of appeal filed by an appellant under section 130 of the Summary Courts Act, prior to the commencement of the Summary Courts (Amdt.) Act 2003, that was filed outside of the time prescribed in section 130(2) of the Summary Courts Act is declared to be valid, as if it had been filed in accordance with the said section 130.

Members would recall that in order to satisfy the court that the prisoner had submitted his notice of appeal to the prisons authorities within time to qualify for the benefits that are intended to him by way of this amendment, in subsection (2), the Attorney General proposed that the prisons authority establish a register, where it would be recognized that the appeal was filed to them and it would have had to be signed by the receiving officer and the prisoner, who tendered it to the prisons authority.

The Member for Pointe-a-Pierre in her contribution made overly heavy weather of this. In fact, she described this very necessary provision in respect of the register as the establishment of—to use her words—“a parallel bureaucracy in the prison”. This to my mind is for evidential purposes. If the prisoner wants to convince the Court of Appeal that he submitted his notice of appeal on time to the prisons authority, there ought to be some independent record. While it may be, if you like bureaucratic, it is absolutely necessary. I want to let the Member for Pointe-a-Pierre know that bureaucracy is not necessarily a bad or dirty word or concept. It can be. In my view, this provision is necessary for evidential purposes. I would not treat it as any unnecessary bureaucratic hold up. It is a sensible provision.

The Member for Pointe-a-Pierre belaboured the point of the validation provision ad nauseam. The Member was attempting to argue and I would quote an

Summary Courts (Amdt.) Bill
[MR. F. HINDS]

Friday, April 11, 2003

element or two from her contribution. She promised us a very clear and analytical espousal of the law, but she did not do that. Let me quote a bit of what she had to say.

“Put very succinctly, what this is doing is giving access to broad validation to all appeals that have been filed out of time.”

That could not be more inaccurate. I wondered as I heard it, whether the Member was mistaken. As she went on I realized that it was not a question of any mistake, it was deliberate. It is consistent with the antisocial and unparliamentary conduct of those on the other side. [*Interruption*] I refuse to be drawn into any brawl this evening. I have come here to support the Attorney General’s proposition and I will do so without fear and with the dignity that my father, mother, grandparents and the PNM taught me. [*Desk thumping*] Just in passing I want to say that I heard many years ago and verily believed to be true, you cannot win a spraying match with a skunk. I “doh” intend to get involved in “no” spraying match with anybody.

The Member said that it gives broad approvals. In other words, all appeals that are filed out of time would be covered by this provision. That is absolutely incorrect. If the Member for Pointe-a-Pierre had taken the honesty to analyze the provision, she would have realized that the amendment before us deals with some but not all notices of appeal. It deals with those that come from prisoners and/or persons in custody because of their particular circumstances. To say “all” is absolutely incorrect. The Member for Siparia is asking who said that? “Well leh meh tell she who said that.” She is now denying it, like Peter. She is withdrawing, resiling from her position, so I would ignore it.

Let me continue. It deals with persons who are in custody specifically. This amendment is intended to deal with a particular problem. It is that of persons who are in custody and who are not at liberty to look after their affairs and rely on the authority. As we know from the case of Whiteman and the Attorney General, a well known constitutional case, it is only the State that could infringe a person’s or an individual’s constitutional rights. If the prisoner had given his notice of appeal to his wife or girlfriend, or to her husband, boyfriend or grandmother, that prisoner would not have been able to argue that his or her constitutional rights were being infringed by the lateness. It is only the fact that the medium is the State that is the prisons authorities that brings the constitutional element into play. It is designed for a specific purpose.

The Member for Pointe-a-Pierre went on ad nauseam, mile-a-minute. I am quoting again.

“It is very wide and an all embracing validity...One might argue that this is good for the administration of justice. That is to say, a wide validity

provision. But now let me explain to the Attorney General as best as I can. If I were one of her legal advisors I would have told her...”

I would not bother to quote this. The Member went on to say something that in our view is very trite and well known to all lawyers and parliamentarians, perhaps. When a person lodges an appeal, if a person was sentenced to three years imprisonment and filed an appeal from the date of his or her conviction and sentence, the sentence does not begin to run until the appeal is heard and determined. That is trite. Everyone knows that. She spent two paragraphs utilizing the precious resource that is *Hansard*, to say that which was so obvious. Everybody knows this. She continued to belabour her point.

She went further to say:

“...the reality is that if his appeal which was filed out of time is now made valid by this particular clause 3, it means that the particular appellant who might have felt that his appeal was out of time so that he had no recourse to the court and his time was running from the day of his appeal, he is now going to be faced with a situation where his appeal is valid.”

I know that it sounds convoluted. I found so when I heard it and read it. Let me attempt to explain what she was trying to say. She was trying to say that as it now stands, if a prisoner is aware that his notice of appeal did not get to the Clerk of Appeals on time, because of that awareness, he knows that he would have no appeal and would consider that his time has begun to run from the day of his sentence rather than from the day of appeal. That is most convoluted and strange. It is not how he feels. It is what the law is. If he wants to reflect what he feels, he has to do so, hopefully, in writing to the Clerk of Appeals. He could write and say I am aware my appeal did not get to the clerk of appeals' office on time and I give notice now that I will no longer be conducting my appeal and I want to withdraw same. It is only on that basis that his sentence would begin to run from the date of conviction. That is commonsense. To stand in this House and say that the man would be sitting in a cell at Golden Grove or Frederick Street, and think to himself that his time is running because his appeal is late, is really taking things a little too far. That is typically UNC. Disappointingly UNC.

The argument, clearly, is flawed. Mr. Justice Stollmeyer, she reminded us, when he was faced with some of these problems—

Mr. Speaker: On the last occasion when you kept repeating “she”, the honourable Member for Tabaquite correctly asked you to refer to the hon. Member as the “hon. Member”. As far as possible refer to the hon. Member as the “hon. Member”.

Summary Courts (Amdt.) Bill
[MR. F. HINDS]

Friday, April 11, 2003

Mr. F. Hinds: Mr. Speaker, I am guided. I am fully aware that we ought not to use the pronoun “she”, but to say the hon. Member. When I do it, not with any malicious intention, it just happens almost naturally. I would bear it in mind. I am grateful to you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Justice Stollmeyer when he had to deliberate on a matter where prisoners filed constitutional motions, saying, “I was denied my constitutional right to appeal”, he awarded in two cases, nominal damages of \$5,000 to two such applicants. Because the prison officers did not get the notices in on time, they were effectively denied the right to their appeal which is enshrined in the Constitution and therefore, damages of \$5,000 in two cases were awarded. Those awards were not for the fact of the imprisonment of the prisoners, or the fact that they were in custody of the State, but for the fact that they were denied their rights to appeal. That is a distinction that appears to have escaped the Member for Pointe-a-Pierre.

The Member for Pointe-a-Pierre is telling the Attorney General that this validation provision would open a floodgate of constitutional motions to all comers. That, as I indicated a while ago, is not and cannot be correct. She was suggesting to the Attorney General that these constitutional motions that she foresees are so likely, would have to do with the fact that the prisoners who believed that their time was running from the date of conviction, but in fact their time would have run from the date of the appeal which they lost, would have been the cause for the constitutional motions.

I raised the issue of Mr. Stollmeyer’s judgment simply to demonstrate to my friend, the Member for Pointe-a-Pierre, and those who are misguided by her on the other side, that the constitutional attack had nothing to do with the fact that they were in custody, but merely because they lost the right to appeal. That is the point. I know that it is a subtlety. When you are as blunderbuss as the UNC can be, these things may escape you. [*Interruption*] This is why we are here and this is why you are there, subtleties notwithstanding.

I have only admiration for the Attorney General’s provisions in this amendment. The Member for Pointe-a-Pierre spent about three pages in *Hansard* utilizing scarce and precious resources, overworking the staff of the Parliament. She spent about 20 minutes on those three pages telling us that the Attorney General should have amended section 72 of the Summary Courts Act. The Attorney General said in her contribution as she presented this amendment that I am aware as Attorney General and practitioner and former judge myself that there are many things about the Summary Courts Acts that require amendment. I

will take it further. There are many laws in Trinidad and Tobago including anti-corruption laws that require amendment to make them more severe.

I am of the considered opinion that our friends on the other side, their position that they are not supporting any legislation that we propose in this House, because they want wholesale constitutional reform, I know that is just a little jerry. I suspect that they are aware that we intend to bring serious anti-corruption legislation with retroactive effect. Maybe they believe so, so they are running scared. She spent time telling the Attorney General that she should have amended section 72. The Attorney General said simply, we are at the moment reviewing the entire summary courts legislation, but an urgent matter—*[Interruption]* I am not in the Cabinet. I am not a minister of government. I am two things. I am a citizen of Trinidad and Tobago who wishes Trinidad and Tobago well. I am a Member of Parliament voted by 12,000 people to stand in this House. I am entitled to say “we”. No one was ever heard to say that I pilfered an election in Laventille East/Morvant. Hard core PNM support! Decent minded citizens whose only ambition was to see the back of a corrupt United National Congress.

I have asked the Member for Pointe-a-Pierre once, and now I must ask her a second time, to drink her porridge cool. Take it easy. We would amend the Summary Courts Act, but the Attorney General argued quite properly and correctly that we have an urgent problem arising. Prisoners’ appeals are not getting in on time and we have to fix it now. We cannot wait for five years for constitutional reform. That is responsible ‘Attorney Generalship’! That is responsible government! We were hoping that we would get the support of a responsible Opposition, but that and a white donkey we probably would never see.

I read editorials daily. I read the newspapers. I listen to the call-in programmes. I look at TV6 and the little segment at the end with citizens giving their views. If the PNM was called irresponsible as often as the United National Congress has been called irresponsible by the media and citizens, we would have huddled in a corner and tried to do something about it. The more they call them irresponsible, the more irresponsible they get. They just do not care! In 2001, 20 constituencies supported the PNM and it would be 30 in 2005.

Mr. Partap: You will pilfer them.

Mr. F. Hinds: As I told you my friend, the Member for Nariva, you will have your time in government with a minimum of 30 years. You have to spend 30 years in Opposition. The next time you and your party would be ready for government would be when we manage to construct a rat proof Treasury.

Summary Courts (Amdt.) Bill
[MR. F. HINDS]

Friday, April 11, 2003

Let me continue. I am being distracted. Mr. Speaker, I seek your protection. I want to return to the provisions of the legislation. I am not going to be disturbed by my friends on the other side

Mr. Stollmeyer granted damages for the constitutional motions of which I spoke but, recently, there was another judgment coming out of our Court of Appeal. It was a very important judgment delivered on March 21, 2003. The quorum was the Chief Justice, Mr. Justice of Appeal Sharma, Madam Justice of Appeal Warner and Mr. Justice of Appeal Kangaloo. This was in the matter of Siewchand Ramanook and the Attorney General. In this case it was held for the first time in our jurisdiction that in constitutional attacks or actions against the State, exemplary punitive damages can be paid. The \$5,000 that Mr. Stollmeyer awarded in those two cases with a recognition now that you can have punitive and exemplary damages, and this could reach to any height. The amount is a matter for the court. The potential for serious loss and payments of damages on the part of the State is real. This, no doubt, influenced the Attorney General's noble action to come to this Parliament to seek the amendment that is here before us. Again, I salute the Attorney General for loving Trinidad and Tobago and doing it the way she has in this legislation.

The Member for Pointe-a-Pierre also suggested that if the hon. Attorney General had to include clause 3, the validation clause that I addressed a moment ago, this provision really requires a special majority. You understand what is happening here, hon. Members? There is no provision in the Attorney General's amendment as presented in this House which requires any special majority. The Member for Pointe-a-Pierre is concocting, UNC-style, a theory that is supposed to demonstrate to us that this clause 3 would require a special majority. Why is she doing this? She knows that we do not have the numbers on this side for that kind of majority. Maybe she thinks in her strange mind that this would be an opportunity for the UNC to stymie another important piece of legislation.

This is why I have said on diverse occasions that there is nothing noble in you anymore. You have lost it. Everything you do, the questions you file, the motions you raise, the very feeble and weak motions of definite urgent public matters that come here on a daily basis, are done with a very ignoble purpose. It is done with the intention of interfering with the smooth business of this Parliament. That does not surprise me. That Opposition denied this country a parliament for one year in this country. Reckless as they are! She wants to concoct in her mind and for all of us the need for a special majority. I want to tell her, no way. As I have already demonstrated the attack is not on the fact that the guys are in prison, but certainly, on the basis of the loss of the right to appeal.

It happens everyday in the Court of Appeal. I have conducted many of them. Some citizens would wonder how, if the appeal is out of time, does it come before the Court of Appeal in the first place? The procedure is simple. Once the appeal reaches the office of the Clerk of Appeals, they have no choice but to list it. They list it and by so doing, the matter comes up for hearing before the Court of Appeal. When it comes, the court sees the date that it was filed and says that it was out of time and the issues flow. It happens everyday. When you get to the Court of Appeal sometimes the prisoner, in the heat of the moment of conviction, files an appeal. He feels aggrieved. He has had an opportunity to sit, safely in the care of the State, at some institution. He is able to reflect and comes to terms often with the situation.

Many times as an attorney-at-law, I have been instructed and we have been instructed by our clients on the day, to withdraw the appeal. If he does, it is a matter for the Court of Appeal's discretion as to whether it would cause the sentence to run from the day the appeal is withdrawn or from the day of his conviction. Both have been done from time to time. There is no need, Mr. Speaker and hon. Members, for any majority. Thank God because if there was, we could be almost certain given their track record, that we would not be able to pass this Bill without severe or serious amendments.

There is one other matter that I want to address before I conclude. The Member for Pointe-a-Pierre in her contribution suggested to the Attorney General and by extension the Government, that rather than come with the amendment that the Attorney General had presented to this honourable House, what should be done is to take the shorter route and improve the jurisdiction of the Court of Appeal. The Court of Appeal has, in its way, made certain suggestions, particularly in the case of Ricky Bernard and Brian Kennedy, Police Constable No. 10187. I do not want to go through the judgment. The Member for Pointe-a-Pierre is suggesting to the Government that it should broaden the jurisdiction or the authority of the Court of Appeal. The Court of Appeal has said that we are guided by the Summary Courts Act. It lays down a strict timeframe of seven days and we are unable to vary, extend and amend it. We are unable to write the law as it were. We should come with a provision giving the Court of Appeal in magisterial appeals—this one the problem arose from—the same kind of authority that the Court of Appeal has in High Court appeals to that Court of Appeal.

The fundamental and simple difference is this. The Court of Appeal operates under the Supreme Court of Judicature Act, under which there is subsidiary legislation or rules of the Supreme Court. In those rules the Court of Appeal has tremendous discretion to do various things in respect of High Court appeals to the

Summary Courts (Amdt.) Bill
[MR. F. HINDS]

Friday, April 11, 2003

Court of Appeal. In respect of magisterial appeals there are no rules as such. It is the strict writing of the Summary Courts Act. Is the Member for Pointe-a-Pierre suggesting that you should have rules which would allow the Court of Appeal discretion? She went further. She said that this validity provision is so wide that even people who fell asleep or who were sick would be covered by the provision. I have already demonstrated that it relates to prisoners' simpliciter and people in custody. I have also demonstrated that the constitutional element only comes in because the medium of the correspondence is the prison authority.

If an individual who was at liberty fell ill or was unable, or gave someone an appeal to file, he would get no protection. The court would quite easily find that he did not act sensibly enough or reasonable enough to be heard. That is the point. Is the Member for Pointe-a-Pierre saying that you should have rules of the Summary Courts Act? I think that her idea only has to be stated, to be rejected. It is of no consequence. I am sure that the Attorney General would disregard it, as I have. I simply decided to address it en passant.

The Member for Pointe-a-Pierre in her contribution—I am to be given the latitude because she spoke and I am replying to some of the things she raised—made mention of the well-known and discussed the Community Environmental Protection and Enhancement Programme (CEPEP). With your leave, Mr. Speaker, I merely want to say to Members on that side that I sat and listened on many occasions to the Member for Couva North telling this country and various fora about the concept of social justice and equity and implying that every mouth must be fed. Everyone must be protected. Today, the attack that the Members for Pointe-a-Pierre, Couva North and others are launching on the CEPEP, you wonder if they have forgotten that important concept of social justice.

I want to let the Member for Pointe-a-Pierre know that, I heard the Member for Couva North take the courage to say that when they finish paint stones white—and he said it scathingly, in the spirit of criticism—they would go back to a life of crime. That is implying that all the people who operate in CEPEP, came from a life of crime or are in crime. That is painful and irresponsible to hear from a former prime minister. I know many decent people who operate in CEPEP who have never had an adverse contact with the law. I know people who were in crime before, get off and gone back in crime again. I saw one this week with a big entourage walking from the magistrates' court. I did not call any name, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Refrain from that trend of thought.

Mr. F. Hinds: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

When one talks about criminal and CEPEP one cannot make the link so irresponsibly. That is improper. At any rate, the point I am making as I wind to my conclusion is simply this: the people who operate on CEPEP, many of them from my constituency, have children to feed, too. They have children to educate and send to school as well. They are citizens of Trinidad and Tobago, like everyone else.

2.30 p.m.

There are people in this country who, if they have a criminal case, could afford five lawyers, two senior counsel and three other lawyers from abroad, in some cases. I heard the other day—and we are talking about appeals—two young men from somewhere in the sugar belt were charged by the police for arson of the administration building at Caroni (1975) Limited. The day may come when they may want to access the provisions of this Bill; you never know. They were charged for the offence.

I have noted, carefully, that Members on the other side are talking about Community-Based Environment Protection and Enhancement Programme (CEPEP), crime, community leaders and all kinds of things but I did not hear one of them speak about arson; like for them arson is not a crime. One would have thought that the arson at Caroni (1975) Limited would have troubled the Member for Couva North, the Member for Caroni East, the Member for Pointe-a-Pierre and the Member for Princes Town, but not a word from any one of them about that fire; like it is not an offence. I have reasons to believe that irresponsible people, who are high in our society, may have incited those young men. We are dealing with appeals and God forbid if these young men—

Mr. S. Panday: You now realize.

Mr. F. Hinds: Now realize, I am always conscious about it.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members, the speaking time of the hon. Member has expired.

Motion made, That the speaking time of the hon. Member be extended by 30 minutes. [*Hon. K. Valley*]

Question put and agreed to.

Mr. F. Hinds: Thank you very kindly, Mr. Speaker and hon. Members. I can assure you that I will not utilize the 30 minutes. I have made my contribution. I have given some support from a proud back bench to our Attorney General. I compliment her. [*Desk thumping*] I want to assure her that notwithstanding the

Summary Courts (Amdt.) Bill
[MR. F. HINDS]

Friday, April 11, 2003

discouraging signs that she sees, quite naturally, from Members on the other side, that there are decent, sensible, people in this country who support her efforts; who recognize that there is a problem with the Summary Courts Act; who recognize that some persons are—because of the tardiness of the prison officials, for whatever reason. This is something we have to improve, not only in the prison service but across the public service; the teaching service; in many elements of the private sector; and the police service. There are inefficiencies affecting people across our country and it is our responsibility to try to improve them.

The Attorney General is responsible for legislation and she is conducting her responsibility with aplomb. I salute her and I urge Members of this honourable House to support this amendment for the benefit of those who are adversely affected and, by extension, for the benefit of Trinidad and Tobago.

I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Subhas Panday (*Princes Town*): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and that was an exercise in irrelevance. I checked as I went along and not more than five minutes were spent on the Bill before the House. My friend, the Member for Laventille East/Morvant, ranted and raved, like a mad man in St. Ann's waving to the public; a mad man in St. Ann's who has taken drugs and his brain has been so fried that he is mad and he is just ranting and raving all over. I am surprised that the Member for Laventille East/Morvant did not appreciate the contribution of my friend, the Member for Pointe-a-Pierre. One would have thought that having been refused a ministerial appointment, and having had nothing to say on the last occasion when the matter—

Mr. Singh: He did not refuse; he was rejected.

Mr. S. Panday: Sorry, rejected. And having been given an opportunity for one week to prepare, he would come and present such garbage to this House. He ranted and raved and I must deal with him a bit because he boasts about being a lawyer.

Mr. Valley: A very good one at that.

Mr. S. Panday: But he does not know section 150 of the Summary Courts Act. He read up to section 130 and he did not even bother to turn the page to go to section 150. I wonder if he really goes to the Court of Appeal. He said that if you withdraw your appeal in the Court of Appeal that the court uses its discretion, and it is the same discretion we are asking the Government to give to the Court of Appeal, and to make the sentence retroactive. He does not know the law! [*Words Expunged*]

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order! Please, hon. Member for Princes Town. No, you are imputing that the hon. Member—[*Words Expunged*]

Mr. S. Panday: He confessed, Mr. Speaker! [*Words Expunged*]

Mr. Speaker: No, no, no, please. I ask you to withdraw the statement, apologize and I want it expunged from the record. [*Interruption*]

Mr. S. Panday: I never beat anybody at any constituency office.

Mr. Speaker: Member, please! Please!

[*Mr. Hinds stands*]

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Member, take your seat please.

Please hon. Member for Princes Town, I am asking you to withdraw the statement, apologize and I want it expunged from the record.

Mr. S. Panday: Mr. Speaker, I apologize. [*Words Expunged*]

He says that they would make the sentence retroactive. Section 150 of the Summary Courts Act—[*Interruption*] Mr. Speaker, you have given the Member for Laventille East/Morvant protection but look how he behaves.

[*Interruption*]

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order!

Mr. S. Panday: Section 150(1) says:

“After the pronouncing of the judgment of the Court of Appeal, and subject to this section, the Magistrate or Justice from whom the appeal came shall have the same jurisdiction and power to enforce, and shall enforce, any decision...”

I go on to the major point, Mr. Speaker.

“Where, however, an order for the imprisonment of any person is affirmed on appeal, whether with or without modification or amendment, or where the Court of Appeal orders the imprisonment of any person, the Court of Appeal...”

I do not want to say he is dishonest, Mr. Speaker, I would say he is ignorant. I doubt that he would be so foolish to come and mislead the Parliament like this.

He went on, again, to attack the Member for Pointe-a-Pierre. I want to give him a dose of exactly what he gave the Member for Pointe-a-Pierre but Mr. Speaker, you have saved him on this occasion. That Member for Laventille East/Morvant takes liberty and has been given the opportunity and the privilege to attack us, and we must sit here and take it?

Mr. Ramnath: And protected.

Mr. S. Panday: Yes. With respect to clause 3 of the Bill, he went on to attack the Member for Pointe-a-Pierre when he said that she did not know what she was saying, when he said that the Member said that it was an open field day for anybody who had a notice pending. The Member said the heading of the Bill is: “An Act to amend the Summary Courts Act, Chap. 4:20” and he went on to the side note which says:

“Notice of appeal by a person in custody.”

What the Member for Pointe-a-Pierre was really saying; when one reads clause 3 it says:

“Every notice of appeal given by an appellant in custody under section 130 of the Summary Courts Act prior to the commencement of this Act which was given outside of the time prescribed in the said section 130 and is pending is declared to be as valid as if it had been given in accordance with the said section 130.”

The Member for Pointe-a-Pierre said that this would also include people who were in custody and whose appeal came before the court and had been dealt with. What we are saying—to make sense to this section—is simply this: “Every notice of appeal filed by an appellant under section 130 and which is still pending.” all we have to do is to include that and it would take it out of the ambit of “Every notice”. But when we are interpreting the law, we interpret the law, as Mr. Speaker knows, as the literal rule, the golden rule, et cetera and if we really want to put a proper interpretation to this, all we need to say is: “Every notice of appeal filed by an appellant under section 130 and which is pending,” and that deals with the problem.

The Member from Laventille East/Morvant does not understand what he is doing. He does not understand! He spends all his time trying to insult people! He has no content whatsoever! That is the style of the PNM! No vision in the PNM! Mr. Speaker, not only no vision by the PNM but it is also a Government which is characterized by incompetence and corruption; that is what the PNM is! [*Desk thumping*]

So when the Members stand there and make statements to hit us, they behave in the same way as they behaved with the Elections and Boundaries Commission; attacking the leadership of the commission, and at the same time in cahoots with other Members to voter pad and to thief the election. [*Desk thumping*] It is time to hit back! We are not taking those kinds of blows anymore! We are not going to permit you to mislead this population! The Member made all kinds of remarks about

corruption. Who is more corrupt than the people in the CEPEP? *[Interruption]* That is the 10 per cent man who is speaking, Mr. Speaker; little or no content whatsoever.

Let us look at the mischief which takes place here. It says in section 130 that when you are convicted, you need to file an appeal within seven days and the clerk of the court, in which you were convicted, must receive this appeal within seven days. What happens is that when persons are sent to prison, the prison authority fails to send the notice within seven days to the clerk in the relevant magistrates' court. When it goes, no communication is made to the appellant informing him that his appeal is out of time. That is what the Member for Pointe-a-Pierre was saying and that is what the Member for Laventille East/Morvant did not understand. Mr. Speaker, the appellant sits there thinking that his appeal is valid and it is only after a long time, after he has spent this time in custody, when the matter is listed in the Court of Appeal and the matter goes before court, the Court of Appeal then says: This notice has been filed or received by the Clerk of the Peace out of time and therefore there is no appeal before the court. This is where the injustice lies.

Mr. Speaker, there is an administrative bungle. What could happen there is that if the notice is out of time and it reaches the Clerk of the Peace after the seven-day prescribed period, all the Clerk of the Peace has to do is to inform the prisons that the notice is out of time; inform the prisoner that his appeal is out of time, and as such allow the man to start his time so that he would come out after he has served his sentence. What is happening, however, is that sometimes one gets a six-month jail sentence and would have to wait for that appeal to come up for about three years. Three years you have been sitting in the prisons, not knowing, but thinking that your appeal is in time, only to find out after a period of time that there was no appeal before the court and, as we say, at that time your time begins to run. That is the problem we are facing and that is the problem we are trying to solve today.

On many occasions the Court of Appeal has tried to mitigate and what they usually tell the attorneys and the appellants in the Court of Appeal is that the Court of Appeal bends backward to see that justice takes place. When the Member for Laventille East/Morvant tries to cast aspersions on the Judiciary, that is the characteristics of the PNM. The Court of Appeal tends to bend backward to say, the Act speaks about notice of appeal but it is silent on the issue of sentence. What the Court of Appeal then tries to do is to vary the sentence to mitigate the pain and suffering of the appellant.

This Government makes all kinds of excuses. It seems to me this Executive is at war with the Judiciary. Why do they not wish to give the Judiciary a discretion?

Summary Courts (Amdt.) Bill
[MR. S. PANDAY]

Friday, April 11, 2003

His Lordship, Chief Justice De La Bastide, as he was, when the matters came before the court—the Member for Laventille East/Morvant would never remember what he said—said “Maybe the legislation should be changed so that time may be extended so that the Judiciary, the Court of Appeal, would be given the opportunity in certain circumstances to extend the time and that is what we are saying on this side.

The Member for Laventille East/Morvant, the proud back-bencher of the PNM, who saluted the efforts of the Attorney General, does not understand what he is saying. We are saying this will create more confusion than before. It says in clause 130A

“(1) An appellant who is not granted bail or is in custody is deemed to comply with section 130 if he serves the notice of appeal upon the Commissioner of Prisons within the prescribed period, whereupon the appeal shall be commenced in accordance with that section.”

That is the most important part of clause 130A. Clause 130A(2) says:

“(2) The Commissioner shall keep a register in which he shall enter the date and time of the receipt of any notice given to him and upon receipt of such notice, he shall sign the register and cause the appellant to affix his signature or mark thereto.”

It says further, in clause 130A:

“(3) Upon compliance with subsection (2) the Commissioner...”

That is the Prisons Commissioner:

“shall transmit the notice to the Clerk of the Court within seven (7) days of its receipt.”

So section 130A(2) and 130A(3) are merely procedural. The question to ask is: What are the conditions in prison? Those of us who have practised know that many prisoners are told, on entering prison: “You have no rights here. Your rights ended when you entered the prison.” If for some reason or the other the prison officers decide that you came in there and they would deal with you, that prisoner may lose his seven days. Before he settles into jail and he realizes that he could have exercised his rights, seven days would have passed.

There are instances and reports of many prisoners who claim that the moment they enter into prison that they are beaten by prison officers; prison officers set up other officers to beat them; they commit serious acts of gross indecency on them.

Sometimes there are people who are in prison for the seven days and they are still confused, or to use the common term, they are still “bazodee”. So what happens here is that section 130 A really does not extend the time as the honourable Chief Justice, as he was, said. What this has done is to create two seven days, one seven days in 130A, where you must file the appeal with the Commissioner of Prisons within seven days. What the learned Chief Justice said was: Suppose you were in prison; you were among prisoners and people whom you did not know; suppose there was a legitimate reason why you could not file in that seven days. The Court of Appeal was saying, you give us discretion, we would look at it; it would be discretion which we would use with a judicial mind and we would decide whether to extend the time in those circumstances. This is the reality.

That is why the drafters of the Bill—one wonders whether the hon. Attorney General consulted with persons who are involved and associated with this type of work. Has she consulted with the Law Association; with the Prison Association; with criminal lawyers, with community leaders—not like the lawyer who is getting a million dollars in the Piarco enquiry who does not read at all? So we are saying that the section does not really open wide enough to assist people who can be disadvantaged. [*Interruption*]

Mr. Speaker, that is the Member for La Brea and I would give you, in private, a joke about what he calls status quo. [*Laughter*] It is too embarrassing and humiliating for that to go into *Hansard*. [*Interruption*] Yes, Uncle Tom. You know since the last time somebody raped her again. [*Interruption*] Yes, since the last time they raped her again in Tobago.

What my friend, the Member for Pointe-a-Pierre, was saying was that we could have left the law as it is and merely say, after section 130 in the present law: “The Court of Appeal shall have the discretion to extend the time for filing notice of appeal in certain circumstances.” One line! I repeat, after section 130: “The Court of Appeal shall have the discretion to extend the time for filing notice of appeal in certain circumstances.” Mr. Speaker, one cannot just go before the court and say: I am out of time, please accept my notice. No, no, you have to give an explanation as to why you have filed out of time. Why is the notice out of time? The court does not act willy-nilly. I do not know if it acted so when the Member for Laventille East/Morvant said that the Attorney General was a judge; I do not know if it happened at that time. But if you want to have the goodwill of the Court of Appeal you must come with clean hands and a substantive application. It seems to me that this Executive has no respect for the Judiciary in this country, none whatsoever. So that is one gap that we have criticized.

Summary Courts (Amdt.) Bill
[MR. S. PANDAY]

Friday, April 11, 2003

They are jumping up and down the country saying that we are not performing our duty but today I have given an amendment to the Government and, Mr. Speaker, you will see they will never accept it but they want us to support them blindly all the time, even when they are so incompetent and are doing the wrong thing. We want to let this nation know we intend to perform our duty according to our oath. *[Interruption]* Shame? Baldhead Uncle Tom behaves like that.

Mr. Speaker, section 130A(2) says:

“The Commissioner shall keep a register in which he shall enter the date and time of the receipt of any notice given to him and upon receipt of such notice, he shall sign the register and cause the appellant to affix his signature...”

If the Commissioner—and here commissioner means prison officer—fails to do it, what happens? The Attorney General would say that is another matter; there are prison rules for that. But we want to ask the Attorney General what are the sanctions which would be placed upon the prison officer or the Commissioner of Prisons for failing to follow the law? There is no sanction whatsoever! So this amendment is hanging by itself without any support to protect the same people whom we are trying to protect. That prison is a place of discrimination, corruption, racism and incompetence.

Mr. Speaker, you would remember the case of Doodnath Rajcumar who worked for 30 years as a prison officer and who said that he was discriminated against. He acted as Prison Officer II for 14 years and trained other prison officers and saw them being promoted before him. This prison officer had no recourse. He complained to the Commissioner of Prisons; he kept on complaining to his superintendents and there was no redress. He had to go to the court and the court then declared—and further than that, for eight years that same Commissioner, to whom you are trying to give this extra power, never saw it fit to have a staff report prepared.

When Mr. Rajcumar said he was not being promoted, they said he could not be considered for promotion because there was no staff report. They did not give him a staff report and then blamed him for not having one and did not promote him. This is the kind of incompetence. He charged racism; he charged incompetence and the locals said no, no, no, no, there is nothing like that. Mr. Speaker, it reached the Privy Council before this man was given his redress. But lo’ and behold when we speak about bureaucracy, this is the kind of corrupt bureaucracy we are speaking about, perpetuated by the PNM. Mr. Speaker, do you know what they did? They promoted him on the last day of his service—after 33 years in the prison service. Do you want to put prisoners’ welfare in the hands of

incompetent people like that? When we speak about incompetent people, we are not talking about incompetence at lower levels but at the higher levels in the prison service.

Mr. Speaker, you were not at the commission of enquiry into the Ramdhani escape. I am certain that you were busy in another place. If you were there—a person like you with such a hard stomach; a concrete stomach—you would have puked when you heard what goes on in the prison; the incompetence in the prison. What we are saying here is that the Commissioner must keep a register. It is mandatory that the Commissioner shall keep a register but there is no sanction on him if he fails to comply with the law. So what kind of law are we bringing here? Are we “mamaguying” the people?

Assuming, but not conceding, that there may be some sanction somewhere, how would that assist the proposed appellant in getting his appeal before the Court of Appeal? If even there were sanctions on the Commissioner of Prisons, how would the appellant benefit from it if the Commissioner fails? That is why we have been arguing—and in another place a prominent attorney-at-law argued the same point, that in those circumstances, if you are really concerned about these prisoners, and I am saying that these appellants who are in prison and cannot take their bail are usually people from the lowest rung of the social ladder, the poorest of the poor have found themselves in this position—that is why we are saying for situations like these, let us give the Court of Appeal an opening to ensure that justice is done.

They have come here and made all sorts of excuses and crazy and irrelevant arguments to say that the law, as it stands, is substantive law and under the Supreme Court of Judicature Act there are rules to deal with the Court of Appeal. We are saying that you do not need any rules here; this is criminal law. All the Court of Appeal says, we have heard what you have said and in those circumstances we are going to extend. This is a case where you are asking for summary justice, not long-winded rules and regulations that would tie you up for years. We want to have it expedited and this is the reason we are arguing this case in such a manner.

When we talk about bureaucracy, we ask the question: Is the prison service competent enough to do what we are asking here in clause 2?

“...time of the receipt...”

It seems to me that the Attorney General is out of her league in this matter. I am not casting any aspersion on you, Madam Attorney General, but you could have at

Summary Courts (Amdt.) Bill
[MR. S. PANDAY]

Friday, April 11, 2003

least asked people. This, for example, [*Member holds up form*] is a notice of appeal where the appellant is a defendant. When it is received in the magistrates' court it is stamped, but when you enter into the prison, it is also stamped, so that there is no need to put all this bureaucracy in place. The document speaks for itself. When we bring this legislation about putting: time of receipt, making the person sign and things like that, we are really giving the impression that we are doing something when in truth and in fact we are creating a quagmire—we are making the situation worse. Mr. Speaker, once the seven days have elapsed the prisoner loses all rights. So this amendment does not go far enough to deal with the mischief which the law was intended to deal with.

The Attorney General, apparently, would argue that when we have oral notice of appeal, which is section 130, and she would argue that we are not amending section 130, but if we ensure that section 130 is complied with, half of the problems would have been dealt with. It says in section 130(1):

“An appeal shall be commenced by the appellant giving the clerk notice of appeal which may be verbal...”

Or as the PNM likes to say, “by word a mouth”.

“or in writing and if verbal be immediately reduced to writing by the Clerk and signed by the appellant or by his counsel or solicitor if he has appeared by counsel or solicitor.”

Now, when can you give oral notice of appeal? You give the oral notice of appeal the moment the sentence is passed. So when we speak about “clerk” and we try to tie up “clerk” with the interpretation section of Chap. 4:20, saying “Clerk” means Clerk of the Peace, here what it really means is the clerk of the court; the note-taker. “Clerk” here—and this could happen because it says “immediately”, so while you are still in court and you give notice of appeal, if you want to say “clerk” means “Clerk of the Peace”, the clerk who sits in the court is the representative of the Clerk of the Peace, and all that clerk in the court needs to have is this same form that I have shown you here. The moment the prisoner gives the notice of appeal; the clerk takes out the form and allows him to sign it right there and that form is taken to the Justice of the Peace later on. One would ask the question: Is there any precedent for that?

Hon. Morean: Just on a point of clarification. I am trying to figure out what point the Member is making in relation to the word “clerk”? I really have not understood.

Mr. S. Panday: I would not say that office should be given by merit but I will attempt to explain.

Hon. Morean: You are not answering. Let me tell you. The word “clerk” is defined in the Summary Courts Act and you are going all over the place; you are going to the Interpretation Act; all sorts of things. The word is right there, “Clerk” means the “Clerk of the Peace”.

Hon. Member: He is being irrelevant.

Hon. Morean: He is not irrelevant, he is wrong.

Mr. S. Panday: This is what I am saying, that the hon. Attorney General does not understand what she is doing. I have never mentioned the Interpretation Act. What I am saying is that even if you want to give a definition of “clerk” to mean “Clerk of the Peace” as the Act says, the “clerk” in the court represents the “Clerk of the Peace”. That is why the law says: “And shall be immediately given in writing.” So you give oral notice of appeal and then you immediately have it.

In the Indictable Offences Act when you are carrying out a preliminary enquiry and it is finished, there are the relevant forms; for example, the bonds. The Member for La Brea is a prominent criminal lawyer, I am certain he would agree with me—you have the forms in court and you say to him: “You are now committed to stand trial, what do you have to say?” He says: “I reserve my defence.” One then takes the form from the desk, which signs as Clerk of the Peace, hands it to him and he signs it. So all we have to do is to ensure that the forms are there, the magistrate is there and we could deal with half of these problems where people are not given bail.

That is why we could ask the Attorney General: Have you consulted with other people? Have you consulted with the Judiciary? I am certain that if the Attorney General had consulted with the Judiciary, merely by the discussion with the Judiciary, one could ask magistrates that if and when they sentence people [*Inaudible*] terms of sentence, if they could inform them at that time of their right to appeal so that the matter could be expedited. If we follow the law, as it is, half of the problems could be dealt with.

The Attorney General would say that when the police take the prisoner down, they do not take him to the Clerk of the Peace, they take him to the prison cell. When the police take him there, Mr. Speaker, the prisoner could beg how much he wants to be taken back to the Clerk of the Peace so his appeal may be expedited but they would say: “Nah man, when you reach in jail you will sign the appeal.” When you are in jail, however, it is a different story.

Summary Courts (Amdt.) Bill
[MR. S. PANDAY]

Friday, April 11, 2003

We have sufficient law in place but all we have to do is to make sure that it works; as if they say you must immediately go to the Clerk of the Peace, a notice to the Commissioner of Police advising all the officers in the holding bay at the various stations and courthouses to ensure that when a prisoner appeals that he is taken immediately to the Clerk of the Peace. The point I am making here, Mr. Speaker, is that we are not attempting to deal with the law as we have it but we intend to make laws to give the impression that by making laws alone we will solve the problem. I am saying that in these circumstances it will create greater problems.

They are saying to pass the Kidnapping Bill; pass laws and laws will solve everything! But at the same time there are laws in place even for kidnapping but they are going up and down the nation saying that the Opposition is not helping them with the Kidnapping Bill and because of that kidnapping is going on. This is what they are doing in this same place; they are not saying that they are hugging criminals; that they are elevating criminals to become community leaders; legitimizing terrorism; as the Member for Oropouche said. They are running up and down the country telling people that the Opposition is the cause of the problem. The PNM is the cause of the problem! The PNM is the problem! They are hugging criminals and treating them, like the Member for Ortoire/Mayaro said, better than the ordinary citizen—bus pass, up and down the highway.

We are saying that what this amendment really does is that it keeps the time frame as it is, merely saying that if you give the notice within seven days to the Commissioner of Prisons, it is deemed to be proper notice. The Court of Appeal never said that, it said to extend the time. Assuming then, if you are so afraid of the Judiciary; if you so want to fight the Judiciary; if you so want to condemn the Judiciary and you do not want to give it that discretion, well then follow the Chief Justice when he said to extend the time to 21 days. Maybe by that time the person would have an opportunity to get advice.

Mr. Speaker, there is something called an inspector of prisons and when the United National Congress was in office, I think, it amended the law to create two inspectors of prisons. At the present time the prison population is so large that it is difficult to even see the inspector who comes once per month. In that one month's time one would be lucky to get on to him if he comes within the seven days of one's conviction. If the inspector comes after the seven days, you cannot avail yourself of the services of that person—who is supposed to be an independent person “protecting the rights of persons incarcerated” to use the law. So what we are saying here is that this legislation does not really help very much.

Mr. Speaker, this is only one side of the story and it is the less important side of the story. The Court of Appeal, his Lordship Justice De La Bastide and now Justice Sharma, have repeatedly complained that there is delay in bringing an appeal to the Court of Appeal. The Attorney General might argue that she does not intend to give that discretion to the Court of Appeal, not only because there might be certain rules, but that there are certain procedures in place and as such you may have to revamp everything. We are saying that is not necessarily so. Because it says that if you give your notice of appeal in seven days; ten days thereafter you must give your reasons. The practice has been, however, that the reason for an appeal in a criminal case, unlike a civil case, is found in section 130(2). You cannot come out of it; it is straightforward and it gives you: the court has exceeded jurisdiction; magistrate personally interested; that you are not guilty. Those are not grounds for an appeal—a reason for an appeal: not guilty; decision unreasonable. So the practice is that the moment you give your notice: “I am not guilty” and your reasons are there.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members, the speaking time of the hon. Member has expired.

Motion made, That the speaking time of the hon. Member be extended by 30 minutes. [*Mr. G. Singh*]

Question put and agreed to.

Mr. S. Panday: Mr. Speaker, I am deeply grateful to Members of the House. The point I was making is that the Attorney General may come and argue that there are certain procedures to be followed after a notice of appeal has been filed and if you give the court that discretion that you may interfere with the procedural aspect of the law. What is that aspect, Mr. Speaker? It is that 60 days thereafter the reasons have been given, the magistrate shall write his reasons. In the meantime the clerk would type the notes and then they are submitted to the Registry of the Court of Appeal and they are listed. The point about it is if you grant an extension, or you widen the time limit, as the Chief Justice has indicated, it does not affect the fact that the magistrate would still have his 60 days in order to write his reasons. So the point we are making here is that it will not affect the procedure which follows the filing of notice and reasons of appeal. In any event you have read the papers and you will see that some magistrates do not write reasons at all and because of that an appeal cannot go from the magistrates' court to the Court of Appeal.

The Chief Justice said recently that no magistrate who has outstanding reasons will be promoted. He is trying to put sanctions. We are saying that if you give that discretion to the Court of Appeal it will in no way impede the operations of the

Summary Courts (Amdt.) Bill
[MR. S. PANDAY]

Friday, April 11, 2003

Act. Magistrates have reasons outstanding for four and five years, so to say that by merely extending the time to file an appeal you will interfere with magistrates, that is not so. Further if the learned magistrate takes a few days extra it does not really affect the appeal.

We have dealt with one aspect of a situation where you are in custody but let us take another view of these appeals, with both persons in custody and persons outside. I was in the Court of Appeal just last week and these are matters now engaging the Court of Appeal: case No. 2421 of 1987; case No. 3794 of 1990; case No. 4633 of 1987; case No. 3211 of 1988 and case No. 3852 of 1986. As I said these came out in the Court of Appeal just last week. So when we talk about extending the time to save the appeal: Is that sufficient? What about appeals that are taking so long to reach the Court of Appeal? We must deal with this also, because dealing with one aspect like this will take us nowhere.

As I said before in my contribution—and when the Member for La Brea gets up he would agree with me—that it is poor people who are suffering. Mr. Speaker, if we are speaking about justice, we must deal with the administration of justice because this is attempting, in a very weak and convoluted manner, to get to the administration of justice.

At this point in time this Government is wasting money, they want to move us out of here and put us in the magistrates' court. Do you know, Mr. Speaker, in that same magistrates' court note-takers are still taking notes in longhand? All the money that has been wasted; this Government intends to further waste money. *[Interruption]* It is an incestuous relationship, yes, for those to whom they want to give the contracts. They want to waste money in all kinds of grandiose plans but simple things as the administration of justice they throw it on the back-burner. They have, however, come to the Parliament to pass these laws to say they are doing something.

We ask the Attorney General, in winding up, to tell us about taking notes by longhand. Why we cannot spend some money on digital recording or CAT recording so that when notes are being taken it could be brought to the magistrate as early as possible? Sometimes it takes one year and a half for notes to leave from the note-taker to the typist because the note-takers are in court all the time and they do not usually have time to prepare the notes. So that the 60-day period you are talking about, we would disrupt that 60-day period. Indeed and in fact, the practice and the bureaucracy which now obtains is preventing that.

Mr. Speaker, we make these contributions—apart from the asides—with the good intentions of the Members on this side. We feel that in the administration of

justice, instead of removing the magistrates' court, on which \$33 million has been spent—[*Interruption*] Okay, \$24 million—the Siparia Magistrates' Court is like a pigpen; Rio Claro Magistrates' Court is like a pigpen; Moruga Magistrates' Court is like a pigpen—Member for La Brea; speak for you? La Brea Magistrates' Court is like a big pigpen; the Couva Magistrates' Court, these are the number of courts that is needed so that you have an environment where people want to work. The Magistrates' Court in San Fernando, the conditions there are so bad that court rises at 1.30 p.m. every day. The court has to close because of the condition of the building. Because of those things, Mr. Speaker, notes cannot be typed; appeals cannot be prepared. As we said, we need to look at it from a holistic point of view and to deal with all aspects of administration, particularly, as it affects the poor.

That takes us now, Mr. Speaker, to another aspect, the Bail Act. Who are the people in prison who cannot get bail? When you are convicted and you appeal, the Act says that you be granted bail, but those persons who are in prison are persons who cannot afford to raise the bail, so being granted bail by a court is like no bail whatsoever. We have a Bail Act, which is repressive, and magistrates, even with that repressive Bail Act, are refusing to work the Act in such a way so that it would assist poor people. For example, if you want to take bail for somebody you must have a deed; the deed must be a clean deed, you must not have taken bail on that deed, whether the property is worth \$500,000 and the bail you took was \$40,000 and you have \$460,000 equity, they say: "No, you take bail already, you cannot take bail again." That is why so many of those people who are seeking the aid of this law are in there. Maybe the Bail Act should be amended so there could be professional bailers like companies and so on. What do you say, Member for La Brea?

Mr. Bereaux: Yes, I agree, but that would need a special majority.

Mr. S. Panday: No, no, no, that would not need a special majority. As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, companies could be formed and those companies could take your bail, they are paid a fee and they monitor you. So the Bail Act needs to be amended because it was this PNM Government that brought the Bail Act. When that Act came before the House they said if you had three charges pending; if you had three allegations against you, you must not get bail; it would be denied. We argued against that; we said no, a charge is an allegation so with merely three allegations a man must not be denied bail. We then caused the Act to be amended to say, if you have three convictions for three offences, which occurred on three separate occasions—what could happen if they wanted to deal with you, Mr. Speaker, they could hit you with robbery with violence; assault and battery, or

Summary Courts (Amdt.) Bill
[MR. S. PANDAY]

Friday, April 11, 2003

whatever it is and they catch you with three convictions on one incident. We argued at that time that it must be three convictions arising out of three separate incidents.

So when they come to the Kidnapping Bill they are going to the nation—same way; PNM style—saying that once an allegation of kidnapping is made against you, bail must be denied. They are going to the country and trying to sell the message that it is because of the UNC that they cannot deal with the people who are committing kidnapping offences.

3.30 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the Kidnapping Bill is so inefficient, badly drafted and not well thought out that it gives a new definition to kidnapping. It says if you “entice or induce”, not “seize and carry away”, which is true kidnapping according to the common law. Kidnapping, according to common law, is to take against one’s will—take away bodily. This law says if you “entice or induce” and goes further to say that a person under the age of 18 cannot consent to be induced or enticed. They are making kidnapping a statutory offence for which a person has no defence. In our culture, for example, if a young man is “liming” a girl 18 and the parents want to deal with him, they could just go to the police and say he kidnapped their daughter. On an allegation like that, they want to say, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: It was not more than about two weeks ago that I heard you making that same contribution on the Kidnapping Bill.

Mr. S. Panday: Yes, Mr. Speaker, but their heads are so hard I think repetition is necessary.

We need to amend the Bail Act to give greater effect to this legislation, which is before the Parliament. It is a holistic view. As the Member for Pointe-a-Pierre was saying, when dealing with justice and the liberty of the citizen, they cannot, because something is happening, act on emotion. They cannot throw away the baby with the bath water. They must make laws that will stand scrutiny and, as the old professors say, the law that can stand scrutiny is like good wine—it matures with age.

The PNM must not use us as excuses. They are incompetent and must go to the country and say how incompetent they are and not blame the United National Congress for their weaknesses. [*Interruption*]

You are coming to Princes Town on Saturday. I am not the one to say I cannot guarantee your safety, but it is the PNM people who cannot guarantee your safety

in Princes Town. On Monday I will tell you the name of one of the “fellas”. He told me to deal with you politically, but I would not do it today.

That Member for Ortoire/Mayaro smiles like daddy when he was a minister. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Before I take your contribution, Member for Siparia, we had agreed that the hon. Minister would make a statement and there was agreement for deferral. Are you prepared to make that statement now?

CARONI (1975) LIMITED

The Minister of Trade and Industry and Minister in the Ministry of Finance (Hon. Kenneth Valley): Mr. Speaker, first of all, I thank the House for its indulgence.

I have been authorized by the Cabinet to make the following statement in respect of Caroni (1975) Limited. This statement concerns the stark financial realities of Caroni (1975) Limited, which is, once again, unable to meet its financial obligations.

This honourable House will recall that the 2003 Estimates of Expenditure, which were approved, included an allocation of \$90 million for recurrent expenditure for Caroni (1975) Limited. However, Mr. Speaker, by the first week of March 2003, this budgetary allocation was fully utilized. Caroni (1975) Limited has informed the Government that it is not in a position to continue its operations without further financial assistance and the amount that is required is approximately \$489.3 million, which represents the projected deficit only, for the year up to September 30, 2003.

You will recall that employees of Caroni (1975) Limited have been offered an enhanced voluntary separation package, effective July/August 2003. As part of the implementation of the VSEP, Government has assumed responsibility for meeting the deficit on the employees’ pension plan and this deficit is now estimated at approximately \$300 million, rising from the \$235 million already estimated. This has brought the overall severance package to close to \$1 billion.

This morning, at a special Cabinet meeting, the Cabinet agreed that Government will source the long-term financing of \$489.3 million on behalf of Caroni (1975) Limited to allow for the meeting of the deficit up to September 30, 2003. Thus the total borrowing, simply for 2003, will be \$1.5 billion—the total support for Caroni (1975) Limited. This amount does not include the \$735 million in loans to Caroni (1975) Limited, which are now being serviced by the

Caroni (1975) Limited
[HON. K. VALLEY]

Friday, April 11, 2003

Government of Trinidad and Tobago, nor does it include \$300 million due to the State in respect of outstanding statutory liabilities.

So, as at today, the cost to the taxpayer of Caroni (1975) Limited is \$579.3 million, which represents the deficit financing for fiscal 2003; \$90 million, which was already used; plus the \$489.3 million that is now required; \$735 million debt being serviced by the State; \$300 million in statutory liabilities and \$1,000 million for the voluntary separation package, for a total of \$2,614,300,000. This is in addition to the \$2.4 billion, which was written off by the State way back in 1992. We are talking about \$5 billion. Quite simply, I think—

Mr. Ramnath: What are you trying to say?

Hon. K. Valley: I am saying it now. Listen carefully! Caroni (1975) Limited, in its present form, is a cost which cannot be sustained by the taxpayers of Trinidad and Tobago. I thank you. [*Crosstalk*]

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order, please! Order, hon. Members!

Mr. Ramnath: They do not need anything. They do not need Indians.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please! Order, please! Hon. Member for Couva South, please.

There is a convention that when one Member speaks, another Member on the other side would speak. There is also, in the Standing Orders, a provision, which says that whichever Member stands and catches the Speaker's eye, the Speaker would recognize. It is either that leaders get together and agree on the convention, or I will have to obey that Standing Order. In this case, I caught the eye of the hon. Member for Siparia before the hon. Member for St. Ann's East. Leader of Government Business and Chief Whip, either you come to some agreement one on one, or I will follow the Standing Order. In the instant case, I caught the eye of the Member for Siparia and I will allow her to speak.

SUMMARY COURTS (AMDT.) BILL

Mrs. Kamla Persad-Bissessar (*Siparia*): Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I join this debate just to make a few points on the Summary Courts (Amdt.) Bill, a three-clause Bill, which engages the attention of the House and which generated quite some debate last week and continues to do so today.

I heard what appeared to be a very profound statement made by the hon. Attorney General last week when she piloted the Bill and I have with me the *Hansard* of what appeared to be so profound. I thought about it, Mr. Speaker, and

I will ask you to decide whether we can take the words of the hon. Attorney General on their face value when she made such a statement in this House last week.

I mean no disrespect to the hon. Member. I remember distinctly, when the statement was made, that both the Member for Couva South and I queried it and the hon. Attorney General repeated the statement. The statement was:

“Because if it is in writing, it is verbal and if it is oral, it is verbal.”

It means therefore that oral equals written. It is a non sequitur. Before that the hon. Attorney General had referred to section 130 of the Act. I think every school child has a copy of a dictionary, so even not looking at the legal term as a term of art in law, it is very clear that verbal refers to what is oral. If we look at the Act the Attorney General referred to, it makes that distinction so very clearly. The Attorney General says:

“Section 130 of the Act provides that an appeal for the Magistrates’ Court must be commenced by the appellant giving to the Clerk of the Peace notice of appeal which may be either verbal or in writing, and if it is verbal the Clerk must immediately reduce the notice to writing...”

The Act itself makes the distinction. Where it is a verbal notice, it is then reduced to writing. On this basis, it is difficult to follow the argument of the hon. Attorney General.

Last year, when we had the episode of the “breakfases”, I thought that was quite humorous, but this one is quite serious. Here we have an hon. Attorney General who cannot understand the distinction between verbal and written. We have a serious problem in this country.

I was very disappointed with the contribution of the hon. Attorney General and that of my friend, the Member for Laventille East/Morvant. Looking at his contribution, from last week, as well as this week, he really had very little to say and the arguments put up by my colleague, the Member for Pointe-a-Pierre, still stands after all the arguments he gave. His entire contribution, which lasted beyond his normal speaking time, I thought, was—you know there is an expression “Me thinks he doth protest too much”—repetitious. He kept saluting the hon. Attorney General for the great work she was doing in bringing this three-clause Bill to the Parliament.

When I heard the Member for Laventille East/Morvant speak, I could have heard his angst and his pain that he had been left out of the inner room of the PNM

Summary Courts (Amdt.) Bill
[MRS. PERSAD-BISSESSAR]

Friday, April 11, 2003

Government. Even while he was speaking, saluting the hon. Attorney General and attacking the points made by the Member for Pointe-a-Pierre with respect to clause 3, they were stabbing him in the back; they were circulating an amended clause 3 to take up the concerns raised by the hon. Member for Pointe-a-Pierre. It is a kind of betrayal by the PNM that while he speaks of their nobility, and while he is there defending them, they are cutting him from behind his back. That is the nobility of the PNM.

He talked about the PNM being so noble and pointed his finger to us and said that we were no longer noble; everything we did was with ignoble purpose. He was standing on his laurels, as a member of the PNM, having been well brought up, while every Member on this side had no noble purpose. I want to disassociate myself completely from that kind of allegation. I am in no way involved in any kind of ignoble purpose that he may speak of. When I am on this side and when I meet with my other colleagues in caucus, we are representing the people in this country who voted for us. Half the population voted for us. That is what we are in this Parliament to do. We do not come with ignoble purposes to look after our own ends. We were not there giving father contract under the Community-based Environmental Protection and Enhancement Programme (CEPEP).

Mr. Speaker, I ask you kindly to think carefully before you rule this irrelevant because the Member for Laventille East/Morvant raised it in his contribution. He said that Mr. Panday had been all over the country talking about social justice and looking after all the citizens of this country and that is what Mr. Panday and the UNC stand for. We do not deny that. He used those words to say that CEPEP was about social justice and that every mouth must be fed.

Mr. Speaker, in every document that has come through this Parliament and elsewhere, it is being shown that CEPEP is being used, not to take care of all the citizens in this country, but as pay back time for PNM supporters. Let us face the reality. Let us not listen to the Member for Laventille East/Morvant. I also read from the other place that CEPEP was this great programme. We have no objection to the principle of the programme. It is the way in which the PNM has implemented it and continues to run it.

When the Member for Tabaquite filed a question and the reply came, you will remember, Mr. Speaker, that every one of those names was associated with a PNM candidate, a member at a high level in the PNM. For example, the persons from San Fernando West—the lady who came before the Elections and Boundaries commission of enquiry to give evidence on behalf of the PNM was awarded a contract for \$500,000. We saw the father of one of the Members of this House—

Miss Beckles, I believe it was—being given a contract. We saw campaign managers for Members who were candidates given this. When the Member talks about nobility and the PNM's programme, CEPEP, being for social justice, it is an example of what PNM considers social justice. It means social justice for PNM friends and family. That is what CEPEP is about and that is why we have been objecting vociferously to the programme.

Now, in the *Sunday Express* of April 06, page 15, there is more information coming out. Contracts have been given to numerous persons—PNM councillors, candidates, campaign managers and so on—all being given these \$500,000 contracts.

Here it is even bigger. It is at the level of the person who is at the top of it.

“CEPEP deal for PNM activist

Market Space Ltd., a company owned in part by a top PNM activist, is reaping major benefits from its involvement in the Community-based Environment Protection and Enhancement Programme (CEPEP). It helped select contractors of the CEPEP, assisted many of them in setting up the companies needed to service the programme, and secured an exclusive contract to provide payroll services to all the contractors.”

The article continues, but basically, this was the main contractor, if we went to call it that. This was the person at the top, who was feeding the contracts out to the selected persons—the campaign managers and others that I have mentioned.

When Minister Dumas was asked about it, of course, there was the normal PNM answer that it was being investigated. When he was asked who was investigating, like this evening—the Government of Trinidad and Tobago—himself investigating himself. That is a little frightening.

The hon. Attorney General in her contribution talked about justice. She said that the Government accepts the principle that access to justice is a fundamental right. It is the responsibility of Government to ensure that every citizen is protected. All the mouthings sound nice, but in terms of the reality of the day, that is not what is happening under the PNM.

They tell us that the way the contract was given out to this PNM activist at Market Space Limited is being investigated.

“Dumas responded by saying...I will have to enquire...if that is so. I prefer not to comment until then.”

Summary Courts (Amdt.) Bill
[MRS. PERSAD-BISSESSAR]

Friday, April 11, 2003

He really gave no comment. That is disturbing because when we raise the question in this House as to who is doing the investigation, the reply is that the Government is doing it. That frightens me a little.

I want to raise a related issue about that kind of thinking and seeing himself investigating himself. I remember distinctly reading—I do not have the exact quotation—with respect to a recent matter in the magistrates' court—I will not mention the case, Mr. Speaker, because I know your thinking on that—where the magistrate ruled he did not have the jurisdiction to enquire into certain constitutional issues and, therefore, he sent it up where it belonged—to the High Court. The hon. Attorney General's comment was that she had looked at the law and she was satisfied that there was a basis for that case to be tried in a magistrates' court. If that is so, then we have an Attorney General who has no jurisdiction and should have none with respect to matters that come before the magistrates' courts and matters dealt with by the DPP. Is she then saying that she has had a hand in those matters? What is the hon. Attorney General telling us when such a statement is made? If she had said differently, then tell us because I am very, very concerned. If an Attorney General can make a statement like that, then it affects the rights of every citizen of this land and it impacts on the justice system of this country when a politician can talk about a case before the magistrates' court in that manner.

Similarly, the Member for Laventille East/Morvant has said that there are some members on charges in court and they would soon be in jail. Has he prejudged those cases? Are they interfering in the justice system to determine the outcome of a case before it has been decided before the proper tribunals? What are they saying?

The Member has raised the CEPEP project, which is the greatest shame and scandal that I have seen taking place in this country under the People's National Movement. Then they stand in this Parliament and make a statement—I do not know what is the point of that statement—to say that Caroni (1975) Limited is a drain on the Treasury of millions of dollars and cannot be sustained by the taxpayers in its present format.

So, they are spending millions on CEPEP, URP and WASA—feeding frenzies for friends and family—but when it comes to Caroni (1975) Limited, the taxpayers cannot sustain it. However, they can sustain everything else that they are doing where they are giving to their friends and families. That is the injustice of the PNM; that is the discrimination of which we speak.

The Member for Laventille East/Morvant said that they were bringing the amendment because they have a problem they have to deal with now, but the other side wants constitutional reform and they will not support us. He made a very important statement when he talked about that constitutional reform. He said they could not wait for five years for constitutional reform. Right away he has told us that the Government has no intention of dealing with constitutional reform. Is that the time frame the Government has set? Why do they need five years to undertake that task? Was he speaking for the Government? He was a proud back-bencher, he said, praising the hon. Attorney General. Does he intend to continue having the country operate in a manner that disregards half the population; that discriminates against half of its citizens and when we speak about it, his only comment is that we are racist.

Mr. Valley: Mr. Speaker, will the hon. Member give way? [*Crosstalk*]

Mr. Speaker: Order, order, please! The hon. Member for Diego Martin Central has asked the Member for Siparia to give way. Is she giving way or not?

Mrs. K. Persad-Bissessar: I am sure the hon. Member will be able to respond after I speak. We may have to get damage time. He took 15 minutes out of my time prior to this, with the long statement on Caroni (1975) Limited.

I talk about that kind of attitude. [*Crosstalk*] Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, they will have a chance. He is saying I did not do it, so he is not doing it either. If I jump in the sea, will he jump behind me? Do not blame us for your incompetence and inefficiency. It is the same thing you are doing with the Kidnapping Bill. [*Crosstalk and Desk thumping*] Do not come to us!

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Member for Diego Martin Central, you will have a full 75 minutes. Please let the hon. Member for Siparia make her contribution.

Mrs. K. Persad-Bissessar: I listened to the contribution of the hon. Attorney General on the Summary Courts (Amdt.) Bill and heard her make these very strong and important statements that should really be made by every citizen in this country; but when I compare the verbal with the reality, it is a total contradiction. The hon. Attorney General says that it is the responsibility of the Government to ensure that the right of every citizen is protected.

“Also, in keeping with its policy and spirit of section 5(2)(h) of our constitution, it is the duty of the Government to ensure that steps are taken to protect and give effect to the rights of individuals and to the freedoms enshrined in the Constitution...”

Summary Courts (Amdt.) Bill
[MRS. PERSAD-BISSESSAR]

Friday, April 11, 2003

The rights of individuals—we are talking about the right to liberty, the enjoyment of property, the right not to be deprived except by due process of law. These are the rights enshrined in the Constitution, yet every day in this country, we live in terror as kidnapers and murderers rampage across the land. What protection is this Government giving us? Then they want to blame us because we did not support their Kidnapping Bill. What protection can they give us? How can we be sure that they will protect our rights when we look at what has happened during the last year under the PNM? We can see what continues to happen under the PNM. So far, for this year alone, there have been 62 murders and 65 kidnappings. When we look at the numbers between last year and this year, there is an upsurge of crime. And they say it is the duty of the Government to protect the citizens?

Where is my protection and where is the protection of all these people who have lost their lives, their properties and have gone through trauma and pain apart from the loss of property they have suffered? Where is the protection from the Government? Is it in the Kidnapping Bill they brought? The Kidnapping Bill deals with after the fact. Saying that kidnapping legislation will stop kidnappings is totally erroneous. They are saying that UNC did not support it, so they cannot give us protection. They cannot give the country protection, but they recognize it is their duty to give us protection. UNC did not support your Kidnapping Bill, therefore let the kidnapers run and rampage. What is the Government doing with respect to kidnapping? It has to do with catching the kidnapper and putting mechanisms in place before people are kidnapped. The Bill deals with the person after they have committed the crime. The Government's duty is to deal with them before it has happened, so that we can walk the streets and live in our homes. Do not wait to catch them. The Bill is about after they catch them. Tell me how many kidnapers have they actually caught? They have to catch them before they charge them.

Do not say the UNC not supporting the Kidnapping Bill is preventing you from protecting the citizens of this country and from carrying out the duty you acknowledge of protecting every citizen.

The hon. Attorney General talked about ensuring the rights enshrined in the Constitution. I am sure you will recall that one of those rights is also that every person must be treated equally before the law. There must be no inequality of treatment before the law. When we were in government, we brought legislation known as the Equal Opportunity Bill. Where is that today? What has happened to it? They say that they want to protect us. In keeping with the policy of our Constitution, it is the duty of the Government to ensure: "steps taken to protect and give effect to rights of individual freedoms entrenched in the Constitution".

This is the contribution of the hon. Attorney General. This is what she said. So, why does she not give me and every other citizen that protection, so that we will be treated equally under the law: whether we are PNM or UNC, Hindu, Christian, Buddhist, whatever it may be. We must be given that protection. If that equal opportunity law had been put into place and the tribunal set up, they could not have a CEPEP operating in the manner it does.

With respect to this amendment, the Attorney General proposed, in clause 3—and this has been bandied about quite a lot—that every notice of appeal filed by an appellant under section 130 of the Act, prior to commencement of the Summary Courts Act, that was filed outside the time prescribed in section 130(2) is declared to be valid.

I am glad that the Member for Laventille East/Morvant came back. I do not think he heard earlier that whilst he was speaking and defending the clause 3, they were circulating an amendment to delete the very words that he was defending vociferously.

In the existing clause 3 that was brought to this Parliament—I am talking about equality before the law—maybe the drafters did try, because what they did in the first clause 3, which is still before me in the Bill here—it says every notice of appeal. It did not matter whether you were in custody or out of custody; it applied to every notice of appeal that had been filed outside of the seven days.

My friend, the Member for Laventille East/Morvant, talked about the Member for Pointe-a-Pierre being convoluted. His argument was even more convoluted. He tried to say that clause 3 applied only to persons in custody, but whilst he was talking I sent for the substantive law and clearly there is nothing here which makes a distinction between the person in custody or out of custody. Clause 3 is clear that it is everybody—in custody and out of custody. That is what the Member for Pointe-a-Pierre was telling him.

The drafters probably did not want to create the situation they have now created with the amendment. They said everybody is equal, so whether it was in custody or outside, everybody will get a chance to have his appeal revived. My friend, the Member for Pointe-a-Pierre, raised all the difficulties associated with that, which I will not repeat and she was totally correct. But, now they bring an amendment. The amendment says that every notice of appeal given by an appellant in custody prior to the commencement of this amendment Act, which was given outside the time prescribed and is pending, is declared to be valid.

So the validation clause and the amended one is saying, first of all, that it must come from somebody who is in custody, so it has narrowed it. It is no longer

Summary Courts (Amdt.) Bill
[MRS. PERSAD-BISSESSAR]

Friday, April 11, 2003

everybody out there. Secondly, it is saying only if a person's appeal is still pending will he get the benefit of this clause 3. I came to this point to deal with the whole business of inequality before the law. If you now do it in this manner, it means that persons—similar to what the Member for Pointe-a-Pierre was saying—who had filed notices of appeal—and they are talking from since 1980 because this is to apply from 1980 to present—we are talking about 23 years of persons who might have filed appeals. Over the past 23 years, there would have been persons who would have filed notices of appeal—in custody they might have been—and when they filed them, they may have been advised by their lawyers or on their own volition, that they have done it outside the seven days, so they abandoned it to let their sentence run from then. That is the point the Member for Pointe-a-Pierre was making. Let the sentence run now so that the appeal, which will be thrown out by the Court of Appeal in any case, comes up six, seven, eight, years later, and is ruled out of time and is thrown out 13 years later—in fact, I understand that 1988 cases are now being heard—the appeal comes up; the court says that the notice of appeal is out of time, it is thrown out, my sentence now stands to run. That is the point the Member was making.

What I did was to obey the law and in obeying I said my notice is outside the seven days, I am going to withdraw my appeal. So I lost my appeal right away without starting. I served all these years inside, but the man who did not pay attention to the law and who filed his notice of appeal, today will be the one rewarded with the benefit of the amended clause 3, by reviving his appeal and saying even though he is out of time, it is now valid. So, they are giving unequal treatment in the law to those who kept pending appeals, as opposed to those who followed the course of the law and abandoned their appeal.

There is inequality before the law in another sense. Here, they are legislating only for persons in custody to have a chance to have their appeals revived. What about persons outside of custody? Are they not to be given a chance as well to have their appeals, if they had filed out of time? I will say why, Mr. Speaker. You have been in the practice of law, as I have, and you know that persons who may have to sign a piece of paper within a particular time frame may not have had that opportunity to sign it. They might have fallen ill. They might have been in an accident. The way the law is framed now, there is no discretion in any court to say that a person was lying in a hospital bed for seven days and could not sign his paper. There is no discretion in the court to extend the time because a person physically could not be there. The suggestion, therefore, has been made—and I totally support it—that the court should have the discretion to decide whether a notice of appeal is in time or out of time. Let the Court of Appeal have that

discretion so that when someone comes up with an appeal, it is outside of the seven days; whether he was in custody or outside of custody, he will be given equal treatment to say that he could not file within the seven days for whatever reason. Anything can happen that is why the discretion is given in the High Court appeals. Give it to the magisterial appeals as well.

So, I am totally against the clause 3 even in its amended form and I have explained why I do not agree with it at all. The first clause 3 was worse, but the new one does not help anybody. It does not really deal with the issue.

The problem that has arisen that the hon. Attorney General said she was coming here to deal with—she said:

“I...add that this is not an amendment because of any flaw in the legislation as such, but it is an amendment because of the inefficiencies occurring because of the acts or misacts...of persons who have to operate the system.”

I suppose by misacts she meant omissions.

Why then is she giving an unfair advantage to persons in custody? Why must their appeals now be revived by her validation? Why does she not give every citizen equal treatment? Let them go before the court and let the court decide if there is a valid reason why they could not sign the statement and have it filed within the seven days. Give everybody an equal chance.

We did not realize last week, but I see today in every newspaper that the judge ordered the release of wrongly imprisoned men because of that said section 72. The Member for Pointe-a-Pierre spoke about it last week. The hon. Attorney General in piloting the Bill said that she was working on it. Yet, in that very contribution, the hon. Attorney General said that this was the worst infraction. If I understand the meaning of the word “worst” infraction, it means it is worse off than what is going on with these other notices of appeal going out of time.

She said that they were working with section 72. They are looking at other amendments with respect to this Summary Courts Act, so we have all these others to bring. So we come today only with section 130 and then we will do this one another time. In this same contribution the hon. Attorney General admitted that they had been looking at it for a year. How long was that? December 2001, so it was all of last year and nearly half of this year as hon. Attorney General in that post, so she has been looking at it and she brings a three-clause Bill here.

I believe a question of how many persons affected was asked in the other place. I believe the response was 27. What about all the other persons wrongly

Summary Courts (Amdt.) Bill
[MRS. PERSAD-BISSESSAR]

Friday, April 11, 2003

incarcerated because of the operation of section 72? Today, in the *Newsday*, we see, at page 7, that Justice Jamadar yesterday ordered that six prisoners be immediately released after he found that they were illegally serving extra time in prisons. This was fairly lengthy, but to summarize it, under section 72, magistrates cannot order a sentence to run consecutively if, in the aggregate, that sentence is more than three years. In other words, they cannot give anybody more than three years, where they are ordering consecutive sentences. In this case, that is what had happened and persons were imprisoned for years; they came to the court and we are going to see a lot more of these. There have been some of them already and there are going to be a lot more. A very simple amendment could have been incorporated here. Why did they not delete section 72? Let the magistrate have the jurisdiction to do that. This is what the Member for Pointe-a-Pierre had said. The Member for Laventille East/Morvant in his response seemed to imply that that Member did not know what she was saying. She knew exactly what she was saying and here is the evidence for it.

In the *Guardian* of today, on page 7, “State faces big law suits”. The hon. Attorney General said, with respect to this amendment, that there was money to be paid and she did not want the State to pay money. What about these? This is going to be even worse—the exemplary damages, the punitive damages, the damages for cases like these; the compensation will be far more than this \$5,000 that she is concerned with for 27 persons. Include the amendment to deal with section 72.

I read from the *Guardian* at page 7:

“A High Court judge yesterday ordered the immediate release of six prisoners who cumulatively served approximately 15 extra years in prison.

Justice Peter Jamadar, in the San Fernando First Civil Court, ordered the release of ...”

The six persons are named.

“In all six cases, the judge said the magistrates in question had no power to order consecutive sentences where the term of imprisonment exceeded three years. He said the sentences should have run concurrently.

Charles served seven additional years in prison...”

as a result of the action of the magistrate who first sentenced him. If the hon. Member is talking about the inefficiencies that are occurring, this is not inefficiency, this is deprivation of liberty. This is a man’s life. This man is cut off

from his family, placed in a jail because of what they call inefficiencies; because of the acts or misacts of the persons operating the system.

It is absolute nonsense when the Attorney General says they could not include other things. Has she been Attorney General for almost a year and a half and this is the explanation she gives why they could not put more into this amendment? Listen to this. I will quote from the *Hansard* of last Friday, from the contribution of the hon. Attorney General:

“In November of last year, I had indicated that we were working to correct the problem when it first surfaced and this amendment was prepared sometime before and it was subsequently laid in Parliament. I may say that this amendment is in relation to an immediate problem that has surfaced, this is not to say that there are no other amendments needed to the Summary Courts Act. In fact, the Chief Parliamentary Counsel, or in fact the Law Reform Commission is looking at the whole Act to determine what other sections need to be amended. So rather than come with section 72 which is next—today we have come with section 130. We do not want to come tomorrow with section 72 and another time with another section.”

That is exactly what she has done. She brought the amendment on section 130 last week and she says she will bring the amendment on section 72 another time. Your explanation is a non-explanation.

“We are looking at it, including section 72 because it is the worst infraction in the sense that there are people serving more time than they should serve, much to the delight of the practising lawyers...”

I do not know why some people seem to have problems with practising lawyers. Once they leave the practice of the law, they start to attack practising lawyers. How can that be the delight of any person that you have persons incarcerated because of section 72 for periods of time contrary to the law and they come to the Parliament nearly one and a half years later and did nothing about it but they say their duty is to protect and look after the rights of the citizen. Our rights in the Constitution are not to be deprived of our life, liberty or property without due process, and there was no due process.

I continue to quote:

“So this is also a problem that is in need of immediate correction, but is one that was already in train before we started looking at the Act to come with further amendments. I would assure Members of this honourable House that

Summary Courts (Amdt.) Bill
[MRS. PERSAD-BISSESSAR]

Friday, April 11, 2003

we are looking not only at section 72 but other sections in the Summary Courts Act to come with a fuller amendment at a later date, but there was need for this amendment to be done urgently to correct the mischief that is occurring as a result of late submissions of notices of appeal by the prison authority...

Because of the fact that this Act is dealing with procedure, we cannot deal with the inefficiencies of the prison service in this legislation. That will have to be dealt with elsewhere because this is really an Act that deals with the procedure. In the long title to the Act it says it is an Act relating to procedure in respect of offences punishable on summary conviction. So the offence has first to be created elsewhere perhaps, and this is the procedure for dealing with the punishment of these offences. This is dealing with a particular situation and we cannot put within this legislation offences, we are dealing with procedure.”

What utter nonsense, Mr. Speaker! Total nonsense! When you are drafting a bill what goes in the explanatory note does not determine the content of the Bill. It is the content of the Bill that determines the explanatory note. To say that the explanatory note says this is about procedure, so I cannot put anything else here is total nonsense; a total misunderstanding of what the drafting of a bill is about. To say that this is dealing with a particular situation we cannot put within this, we are dealing with procedure. In the long title to the Bill, it says it is a Bill relating to procedure in respect of offences so the offence has to be created, we cannot put anything else in there. Nonsense!

The long title is also formulated upon the content of the law. You do not make the law and then decide what to put inside. You do not make an explanatory note and then decide to explain it in the law. You make the proposed law first and then you decide the explanatory note and then the long title to the Bill. So, the explanation given is complete nonsense and it is not good enough. If the Member could not deal with the inefficiencies in the prison service for whatever other reasons, it is not because of the long title of this Bill. It is not because this Bill is about procedure. It is because of her incompetence and inefficiency. The explanations given are nonsense and therefore not good enough.

She said she would not come today and come back tomorrow and that is exactly what she is doing. She brought this one today, left out section 72, which is in every single newspaper today—*Guardian*, *Express*, *Newsday*: I have all of them—in every one of them you see the six persons who have been incarcerated and there are more to come. [*Interruption*] I will read any newspaper I wish. You cannot direct me. You do not buy them for me.

Mr. Speaker, I have never disrespected the hon. Member, but I have to remind him to check the schools in Tobago. I do not interfere with the Member.

We talked a lot about clause 2, about the substance of this amendment. The hon. Members for Princes Town and Pointe-a-Pierre made the point, which I would like to repeat without being tedious. How can they now create a whole new registry in the prisons to receive these notices of appeal and to send them? Why not just let the Court of Appeal have the discretion to decide whether it is in time or out of time? So the appellant who is not granted bail or is in custody is deemed to comply with section 130A if he gives notice of appeal to Commissioner of Prisons within the prescribed time whereupon the appeal shall be commenced in accordance with that section. The Commissioner shall keep a register. He shall enter the date and receipt of any notice given to him.

We already have a problem to correct. The mischief we want to correct is that when a person in custody signs a notice of appeal and give it to the prison authorities, it does not reach within the seven days. Here we have added duties on the prison authorities. So the problem is already with the prisons not forwarding the information on time and they are saying that the solution to that is to add to the work of the prison authorities. In addition to receiving the information and sending it, they now have to make a register. There is a registry already in the courts. Why do they want to create a registry in the prison service? The prison officers do not have enough work to do? This solution to the very inefficiencies they are attempting to correct is not the answer, will not involve the problem and will create a greater problem.

When a man is in custody, he gives the information to the Commissioner, he has to send it on within seven days; what happens when it does not go, are we not back to square one? We are back to square one because there would have been persons in there who sent their notices of appeal, the Commissioner never forwarded them on time, which is exactly what is the position now, and the person loses his right of appeal. This solution is putting you right back to square one. It will not solve the problem

I asked the hon. Attorney General—it is true she does not need our support to pass this Bill because she is convinced it needs a simple majority and the 20 of you can pass it without us, but I ask you to seriously consider that it will not solve the problem. You are entrenching that inefficiency further into the system. What will happen when the same thing happens that they do not send the notice of appeal? [*Interruption*] Is the Member telling me to give them the amendment and

Summary Courts (Amdt.) Bill
[MRS. PERSAD-BISSESSAR]

Friday, April 11, 2003

they will pass it? [*Crosstalk*] Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member for Diego Martin Central is making a suggestion. I will give him one minute to make the suggestion.

Mr. Valley: Mr. Speaker, I was merely pointing out to the hon. Member for Siparia that on the second reading of a bill, we discuss the merits of the Bill—whether we think it worthwhile to do—and at the committee stage, we determine whether there are deficiencies in the Bill to be corrected. She is using the second reading for work that should correctly be done at committee stage. That is wasting the time of the Parliament.

Mrs. K. Persad-Bissessar: So, what should I talk about here? The substance of this Bill is totally flawed. I am not talking about inserting a comma here and a full stop there at committee stage. I am saying that there is nothing you can draft in clause 3 that will convince me that it will be a proper clause 3. With respect to the substance of clause 2, it is also seriously flawed because that is the merit of the Bill. I am not speaking about drafting. On merit this is nothing

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Member for Siparia, I have heard the hon. Member for Diego Martin Central and if I find he is going off course, I will bring him back. Let her continue.

Mrs. K. Persad Bissessar: Well, thank you very much. I thank the hon. Speaker for that protection. The substance of this Bill from clauses 1 to 3 is seriously flawed, therefore I am asking the hon. Attorney General to speak with the draftsmen to consider what has been said because no amendment in terms of changing word, full stop or comma at the committee stage will rescue this Bill and put it in a position to assist the people it is intended to assist.

Mr. Speaker: Will you be much longer?

Mrs. K. Persad Bissessar: No, I am not finished, Mr. Speaker. I am enjoying this contribution.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps, hon. Member, it is an appropriate time to take the tea break. The House is now suspended until 5.00 p.m.

4.30 p.m.: *Sitting suspended.*

5.00 p.m.: *Sitting resumed.*

Mrs. K. Persad-Bissessar: Mr. Speaker, can I be reminded of how much time I have left?

Mr. Speaker: You have about five more minutes, which will take you to just after 5.06 p.m. on your first 45 minutes.

Mrs. K. Persad-Bissessar: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, when we took the suspension of the sitting, I had been engaged in looking at specific clauses that are in the Bill before us. I would like to revisit the first clause 3 that was proposed and the amendment thereto. During the suspension I had some further words with my colleagues, the Member for Pointe-a-Pierre and the Member for Princes Town, and I would like to repeat the point to bring it clearly to the attention of the hon. Attorney General, with respect—

Hon. Morean: I have the *Hansard*.

Mrs. Persad-Bissessar:—no, this is another point—with respect to clause 3. I do not think you would have the *Hansard* right now, Ma'am, with due respect. [*Interruption*] No, no. The clause 3, we are saying, will create injustice to persons who are in custody even though the intention is clear to assist those persons in some way. The injustice that could be perpetrated on those persons could be, I have been advised by my colleagues, that when a notice of appeal is filed, if it had been filed out of time by a person in custody, then that notice is not properly before the Court of Appeal. So really there is no appeal before the Court of Appeal but that is only dealt with when the matter is listed and it comes up before the Court of Appeal. So on that date it will be determined that there is no appeal.

However, the point made by the Member for Pointe-a-Pierre was that it is only on the determination of the appeal that the sentence starts to run. So all these persons who were incarcerated and serving their sentences and so on, who on such a date of the listing of their matter would have gone to the Court of Appeal and the Court of Appeal would have said, “You are out of time and therefore you have no appeal, and therefore you had no appeal from the very beginning, ab initio, you had no appeal from the very start and therefore your sentence was running from the very start”—[*Interruption*]

Hon. Morean: That is if it is dismissed.

Mrs. K. Persad-Bissessar: No, this is the present position. I have filed a notice of appeal, my notice of appeal is outside of the seven days and it is listed. It is listed before the Court of Appeal and in every such instance where it is outside of time the Court of Appeal will dismiss it because it is outside of the seven days. That is the present position.

When you validate those appeals, what you are in effect doing, then, will be saying to all such persons with pending appeals that whilst they had an invalid appeal before the Court of Appeal, on the day it is listed the Court of Appeal would have said, “You had no appeal before me, you are out of time, therefore

Summary Courts (Amdt.) Bill
[MRS. PERSAD-BISSESSAR]

Friday, April 11, 2003

your sentence began from the time you were incarcerated.” You are now going to give life to those appeals so that such a person, only when the Court of Appeal pronounces—the Court of Appeal will no longer pronounce on that ground because now you are validating, they will have a live appeal, and then that live appeal is going to be determined by the Court of Appeal so that their sentence will run.

So I say that is going to create an injustice to those persons who, given that the appeal was out of time, when their matter came up for hearing, would have had no appeal and they would have probably already served five years, you are now saying to them, “I am giving life to your appeal, even though it is out of time, and therefore the court must determine it and your sentence will only then start to run thereafter.” So it will be creating an injustice upon those persons in custody who fall within that kind of situation. I would be happy if you would let us know whether that would be so or not, because once you give life to the appeal that is what is going to happen. There will now be a valid appeal before the court that the court will have to determine.

Upon its determination, only then will the sentence start to run, whether a person was inside or not inside and therefore the point made by the Member for Pointe-a-Pierre clearly will be the issue of whether, in bringing such an amendment, you are going to be opening the doorway for constitutional motions because you are now going to create a situation where people will be seeking redress because of the legislation that you are bringing; you are going to be further depriving them of their liberty and therefore they will bring constitutional motions against the State. So if you can explain that for us, we will be very happy.

With respect to the CEPEP, I would need to return to that as well.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members, the speaking time of the hon. Member for Siparia has expired.

ADJOURNMENT

The Minister of Trade and Industry and Minister in the Ministry of Finance (Hon. Kenneth Valley): Mr. Speaker, perhaps it would be an appropriate time to move the adjournment of the House to Friday, May 02, 2003 at 1.30 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: Before I put the question for the adjournment, there are two Motions on the Adjournment, one by the Member of Parliament for Caroni East and the other by the Member of Parliament for Chaguanas. I now call on the hon.—

SUMMARY COURTS (AMDT.) BILL

Mrs. K. Persad-Bissessar: Mr. Speaker, may I crave your indulgence one moment before we go to—my speaking time had expired and the Member has—
[*Interruption*]

Mr. Speaker: The first 45 minutes.

Mrs. Persad-Bissessar: Yes, but at least have the extension moved now so that when we come back we would not have lost it.

Motion made, that the hon. Member's speaking time be extended by 30 minutes. [*Mr. G. Singh*]

Question put and agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: The Member's contribution will continue on Friday, May 02, 2003.

ADJOURNMENT

**Crime Statistics
(Accurate Police Reporting)**

Mr. Ganga Singh (Caroni East): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on a matter to be raised on the Motion for the Adjournment of the House entitled, "The Need for the Ministry of National Security and Rehabilitation to Ensure Proper and Accurate Reporting by the Police Service of Crimes Committed Against the Residents of St. Helena, Kelly Village, Piarco and its environs for the Period January 2002 to March 2003."

Mr. Speaker, this matter arose in the constituency of Caroni East and it was brought to my attention by the residents of the community of St. Helena Village, Piarco. It is clear that, in order to inform proper policy measures, there is need for the accuracy of statistics because accurate statistics and statistical data are an integral part of the policy formulation process. For example, the Commissioner of Police in yesterday's *Newsday* stated, and I quote:

"65 ABDUCTED, \$20 MILLION IN RANSOMS DEMANDED"

He was quoting a statistic as to the number of persons and the quantum of moneys. Then, on the same page of yesterday's *Newsday*, the Commissioner of Police dealt with the 2003 crime statistics at a glance and he went on to outline various types of criminal activity as far as police records are concerned.

I want to read into the record a letter from residents of St. Helena Village, Piarco to the senior superintendent, Caroni Division, Chaguanas Police Station.

Crime Statistics
[MR. SINGH]

Friday, April 11, 2003

“Dear Sir,

This letter is from the business owners of St. Helena Village. We are sure that you are aware of the spate of armed robberies targeting our business establishments. The situation exists for almost one year but in the last three weeks there has been an exacerbation. At present our families are living in fear. The situation is intolerable. We are appealing for your assistance. Can you please meet with us at a date and time convenient to you? We would arrange the venue. This matter is extremely urgent and we eagerly await your reply.

You can contact us at the telephone numbers listed. Thank you for your kindest consideration.

We remain
yours sincerely,

Dr. Tennyson Sieunarine”

He is a medical doctor in the community and a university lecturer:

“Mr. Benny Bridgelal”

He is the premier entrepreneur and successful businessman in the area:

“Mr. Mahase Ramlochan”

He is a retired public servant and businessman in the area—the core of civil society in the area. They are all members of the Kiwanis Club, writing to the senior superintendent.

Mr. Speaker, I refer now to a letter of April 08, 2003. So this meeting was held and this letter, to the Commissioner of Police now, encapsulates the sentiments expressed at that meeting with the divisional superintendent.

“The Police Commissioner,
Police Headquarters,
Port-Of-Spain.

Dear Sir,

I am writing to you on behalf of the Kiwanis Club of Piarco. During the past two to three years St. Helena and surrounding villages have experienced a dramatic rise in criminal activities. These activities include armed robberies and house break-ins.

Crime Statistics

Friday, April 11, 2003

A group of businessmen from this area recently wrote a letter to the Senior Superintendent Central Division concerning this matter. We subsequently met with him and requested a police post to be set up in St. Helena. He replied, however, much to our alarm, that St. Helena and surrounding villages have none or little officially reported crime in the last two to three years. This obviously means that the official police statistics do not reflect the true crime situation in these districts. We ask you investigate this serious and disturbing discrepancy in crime reporting. We are also again urgently requesting that a police post be set up in St. Helena.

We look forward to an early reply. Thank you.

I remain

Yours truly,

Dr. T. Sieunarine

(Charter President)"

Of the Kiwanis Club.

Mr. Speaker, so here it is the divisional superintendent is saying, "You have little or no crime in your area", but what are the facts? I will give you a list I have been able to quickly compile of the crimes committed against the St. Helena business community for the period 2002—2003. R & RS Drug Mart—they were held up four times in the year 2002 and in the months of January and February 2003. That is not appearing in the police criminal statistics. Hong Kong City Restaurant—they were held up on June 22 in the year 2002; not appearing in the official police statistics. St Helena Drug Mart—they were held up on the dates of February 11 and April 08 in the year 2003. Hoeing Restaurant—their customers and the proprietors were held up and robbed of possessions in the month of March 2003. Fred's Mini Mart—they were held up in November 2002. There have been approximately four car hijackings in the St. Helena area between November 2002 and 2003.

Mr. Speaker, these are all crimes where the police came to the scene but they never entered the data in the statistical log in the police service. This is a serious matter. So it is clear, whereas the Commissioner of Police speaks about various statistics, the crime statistics of the police service lack integrity. This is our experience and it is our understanding that what is happening in St. Helena and its environs is a microcosm of what is happening throughout Trinidad and Tobago.

Crime Statistics
[MR. SINGH]

Friday, April 11, 2003

So therefore, what is effectively taking place is an underreporting of crime and criminal activity. We say that there are several instances where the ordinary citizen does not report crimes but here are instances where crimes are reported yet they are not officially recorded. So how do you resolve this issue? What is the motivation, Mr. Speaker?

The cynical amongst us will say that there may be collaboration and collusion between certain elements of the police service and the criminals, but I do not want to be cynical, Mr. Speaker. I have done some investigation of this matter and it appears that there is something that, within the police service, they call padding—something that they use slang to call padding. What is happening here is that—*[Interruption]* No, you see, this is not a partisan matter. This is a matter dealing with criminal activity throughout Trinidad and Tobago and, because you voter pad in Ortoire/Mayaro, in San Fernando West and in other areas, you want to take paternity for padding, but this is dealing with—*[Interruption]*

Mr. B. Panday: The Speaker owes his seat to padding. *[Interruption]*

Mr. G. Singh: Mr. Speaker, we are dealing with the issue of this slang called padding. *[Interruption]* What is happening is that when—*[Interruption]* What happens is that the police *[Interruption]* do not enter into the official documents *[Interruption]* the crimes committed in the area so that the crimes are underreported. So if the crimes are underreported in that situation, apart from collusion or collaboration between that rogue element and the criminal or, alternatively, if the crimes are not reported, then there are no reasons to investigate the crimes. So what you have are a series of repeat offences taking place. *[Interruption]* Mr. Speaker, it is a series of repeat offences.

Therefore, what we are seeking to do in this matter on the adjournment is, we must point to the fact of the managerial incompetence and the lack of response of the police service to the crime of the ordinary citizens. It is clear to us that if, in a situation where you have core members of civil society, a medical doctor, a university lecturer and a retired public servant, businessmen say, “Look, we know of these crimes that exist in our community”, how come they are not officially reported? We say that is a microcosm of what is happening throughout Trinidad and Tobago. By this approach, you will no longer have confidence in the ability of the police to respond. It will lead to a breakdown in civil society and it is clearly necessary for the Ministry of National Security and Rehabilitation—*[Interruption]*

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Member, please. Would the hon. Members for Laventille East/Morvant and Fyzabad, please, if you all need to carry on, exit the Chamber. The Member is making his contribution and I am getting difficulty hearing it.

Mr. G. Singh: Mr. Speaker, thank you. I was making the point that if a crime is committed against you, you are a victim of a crime, and when you seek to determine whether or not this is within the documentation of the police service and the police represents that arm of the State to protect and to serve you and to establish the basic ground rules for the rule of law and that is not happening, then there is a complete breakdown in civil society. If you have that kind of breakdown in civil society where the ordinary citizen is clearly not in any position to ensure the investigation of the crime, then what are you going to do, Mr. Speaker? This is going to lead to anarchy. There is going to be a process whereby there will be anarchy in the society.

Already, recognizing that they cannot depend upon the police for protection, there are certain elements in the society offering protection to these residents, Mr. Speaker, so that you have extra state elements offering protection because the police are not carrying out the job that they ought to and therefore they are seeking to look good by not reporting the crime, you have less crime in Trinidad and Tobago, but that is a big lie. That is a lie. There is no integrity in the statistics in the police service as a result of that. So there is the need to establish proper and accurate reporting, proper systemic mechanisms within the police service so as to ensure that crimes that are committed against citizens are reported, but, more importantly, that there is an investigation process to solve these crimes because, with the non-reporting of crimes, there is non-investigation and you have continued criminal activity taking place.

One of these drugstores was robbed yesterday at gunpoint, repeat, because nobody—Mr. Speaker, and you know, in the face of all of that, look at the headlines. The *Express*, Thursday, February 27, “Robbery spree fears in St Helena”. “Crime wave sends district into self-imposed curfew” March 09, 2003. The *Probe* Sunday, March 09, “Bandits wanted key to my drugstore. I yelled thief thief.” “St. Helena under the gun”. “We are afraid for our lives”. Mr. Speaker, it is clear to us that in this situation there is a lack of response, there is a lack of integrity and the Ministry of National Security and Rehabilitation ought to respond in a manner that will ensure that a measure of confidence and integrity is brought back into these matters with respect to the reporting of crimes.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you. [*Desk thumping*]

The Parliamentary Secretary in the Ministry of National Security and Rehabilitation (Mr. Anthony Roberts): [*Desk thumping*] Mr. Speaker, it is amazing this afternoon that we have to sit in this House and listen to my good friend, a friend of long-standing, the Member for Caroni East, talking about

Crime Statistics
[MR. A. ROBERTS]

Friday, April 11, 2003

crime, the situation of the police in Trinidad and Tobago when the Member and his colleagues on the other side have had all the opportunities to deal with this matter. [*Interruption*]

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order please! Order please!

Mr. A. Roberts: Mr. Speaker, it is hypocritical [*Interruption*] for the Member for Caroni East [*Interruption*] to make the kind of contribution he is making at this time. [*Desk thumping*] They have had the opportunity [*Interruption*] to work with the Government on the police bills. They have had the opportunity to work with the Government [*Desk thumping*] on the Kidnapping Bill [*Interruption*] so that we could deal with the criminal elements in Trinidad and Tobago today— [*Interruption*—but they chose to abscond and to mock all the opportunities— [*Interruption*]

Mr. Speaker: Please, please, please, hon. Members! The Member is entitled to make his contribution. Please do not interrupt him. Continue, hon. Member.

Mr. A. Roberts:—and choose to come to this honourable House, Mr. Speaker, [*Interruption*] to continue their normal gallery and wasting the time of the people of Trinidad and Tobago. [*Desk thumping*] [*Interruption*]

Mr. Hinds: Civil disobedience and miscreants. [*Interruption*]

Mr. Speaker: Order please! [*Interruption*]

Mr. Hinds: Civil disobedience and miscreants. [*Interruption*]

Mr. A. Roberts: It is clear to me, Mr. Speaker, that they are not at all serious about the business of the people of this country. [*Interruption*] Notwithstanding their behaviour and their attitude, [*Interruption*] as a Government we will continue to do whatever is necessary [*Desk thumping*] to protect the people against the scourge of crime and so I advise this honourable House that the police stations which serve the district of St. Helena, Kelly Village and Piarco are Caroni and the Piarco police stations.

According to the records lodged at those stations, crime reported was listed under the categories of serious crimes, minor crimes and minor offences. Examples of those categories categorized as serious crimes are: murders, wounding and shooting, rapes, serious indecency, kidnapping, burglaries and break-ins, robberies, larceny of motor vehicles, larceny of dwelling houses, and narcotics offences. Examples of minor crimes include: praedial larceny, unlawful possession, assault occasioning actual bodily harm, escaping lawful custody and possession of house-breaking instruments by day. Minor offences, Mr. Speaker,

are categorized as: loitering, assault and battery, assault on police, breach of the peace, armed with a weapon, gambling and betting and other minor offences which are not really stated.

The records at the Caroni police station reflect that for the period January 01, 2002—March 31, 2003 there was a total of 109 serious crimes—93 minor crimes and 163 minor offences were reported—of which a total of 19, 40 and 27 respectively were solved. Mr. Speaker, let me now outline to you the data supplied by the police service on the serious and minor crimes as well as the minor offences reported to and solved by the Caroni police over the same period to which I just referred. *[Interruption]*

Mr. Speaker: Order. Order.

Mr. A. Roberts: Serious crimes. Murder—nil. *[Interruption]* Woundings and shootings—six reported, one solved. *[Interruption]* Rapes, incest, sexual offences—nine reported, four solved. Serious indecency—nil. *[Interruption]* Kidnapping—two reported, one solved. *[Interruption]* Burglaries, break-ins—25 reported, one solved. *[Interruption]* Robberies—39 reported and one solved. *[Interruption]* Fraud offences—nil. *[Interruption]* Larceny including larceny of motor vehicles—10 reported, one solved. *[Interruption]* Larceny, dwelling houses—eight reported none solved. *[Interruption]* Narcotic offences, six reported, six solved; giving you the total of 109 reported, 19 solved.

Mr. Singh: Could the Member give way? *[Interruption]*

Mr. Valley: You know the rules. *[Interruption]* You know the rules. *[Interruption]*

Mr. Hinds: Let the man speak. *[Interruption]*

Mr. Speaker: The rules really do not provide for it. The rules do not provide for that.

Mrs. Job-Davis: You had your chance. Have a seat. *[Interruption]*

Mr. Ramnath: Anybody can give way at any time. *[Interruption]*

Mr. A. Roberts: Mr. Speaker, we move to minor crimes *[Interruption]* which involve indecent assault—two reported, one solved. Assault on police and peace officers—two reported, two solved. *[Interruption]* Possession of housebreaking implements—nil. Embezzlement, false pretence, fraud—nil. Larceny, receiving—42 reported, seven solved. Larceny of dwelling houses—12 reported, two solved. Praedial larceny—one reported, which was not solved. Unlawful possession, one

Crime Statistics
[MR. A. ROBERTS]

Friday, April 11, 2003

reported, and it was solved. Unlawful wounding to do grievous bodily harm—eight reported, two solved. Dangerous drugs—18 reported and 18 solved. Possession of firearm and ammunition—seven reported, seven solved.

We move on, Mr. Speaker, to the minor offences. Loitering—nil. Assault and battery—134 reported, 13 solved. Assault on police—four reported, three solved. Breach of the peace—14 reported, nine solved.

Mr. Hinds: UNC—not yet solved.

Mr. A. Roberts: Armed with weapons—one reported. That was solved. Malicious damage—14 reported, two solved. Gambling and betting—nil. Other minor offences—seven reported, five solved.

Mr. Speaker, the records at the Piarco Police Station showed that for the same period I mentioned before, there was a total of 139 serious crimes—71 minor and 145 minor offences were reported of which a total of 90, 56 and 101 respectively were solved and I wish to provide you with the statistics as well.

Piarco Police Station—murder, nil. Wounding and shooting—nil. Rapes, incest, sexual offences—eight reported, four solved. Serious indecency—nil. Kidnappings—nil. Burglaries and break-ins—13 reported, one solved. Robberies—12 reported, four solved. Fraud offences—22 reported, 20 solved. Larceny including larceny of motor vehicles—21 reported, two solved. Larceny involving dwelling houses—one reported, which was not solved. Narcotic offences—58 reported, and 58 solved. Other serious crimes—four reported, one solved.

We move on to minor crimes. Indecent assault—one reported, which was not solved. Assault on police and peace officers—four reported, four solved. Possession of housebreaking implements—one reported, which was not solved. Embezzlement, false pretences, fraud, et cetera—eight reported, eight solved. Larceny as it relates to receiving—16 reported, three solved. Larceny dwelling houses—nil. Praedial larceny—nil. Unlawful possession, Mr. Speaker—nil. Unlawful wounding, grievous assault occasioning actual bodily harm—nil. Possession of firearm and ammunition—four reported and four solved. Dangerous drugs—10 reported, 10 solved. Other minor crimes—27 reported, 27 solved.

We proceed to minor offences, Mr. Speaker. Loitering—nil. Assault and battery—12 reported, five solved. Assault on the police—seven reported, six solved. Breach of the peace—17 reported, 15 solved. Armed with a weapon—nil. Malicious damage—one which was solved. Gambling and betting—nil. Other minor offences—108 reported, of which 74 were solved.

Mr. Sharma: What do you mean by “solved”?

Mr. A. Roberts: In closing, Mr. Speaker—[*Interruption*]

Mr. Sharma: What “solve” means?

Mr. A. Roberts: In closing, Mr. Speaker—[*Interruption*] I think I saw you with a dictionary earlier on.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, [*Interruption*] I would like to inform [*Interruption*] this honourable House [*Interruption*] and in particular the Member for Caroni East that the police are always willing to assist with information. However, the hon. Member, being a trained legal person, should also be aware that information disseminated in this regard must be undertaken with due caution in accordance with the constitutional rights of citizens as well as the flow of the investigation by the police officers while they are conducting their law enforcement duties. I wish to inform the hon. Member that this Government is satisfied with and supports the manner in which the police officers organize and record the statistical data relative to crime committed against the residents of St. Helena, Kelly Village, Piarco and its environs.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. [*Desk thumping*]

Employment Practices (Chaguanas)

Mr. Manohar Ramsaran (*Chaguanas*): [*Desk thumping*] Mr. Speaker, I rise to really debate a Motion on the Adjournment of the House dealing with employment practices in the constituency of Chaguanas and what the Government has done so far to alleviate what is happening.

Mr. Speaker, what is happening in the constituency and indeed Central Trinidad—and when you listen to the Member for St. Ann’s East you really cannot have the confidence that the police, with the present set-up, could assist with crime in our country—is that there is now no employment for our young people or for our people in general. This afternoon when the Member for Diego Martin Central stood and made the statement and when he ended by saying, “Mr. Speaker, of course I am sure you will agree that Caroni (1975) Limited in its present form is a cost which cannot be sustained by the taxpayers of Trinidad and Tobago”, this will now add to unemployment in the constituency of Chaguanas. I am on record in this Parliament talking about the \$140 million allocated to URP with nothing being done in the constituency and this is different from the borough

Employment Practices
[MR. RAMSARAN]

Friday, April 11, 2003

that I talked about before because part of my constituency falls within the Tunapuna/Piarco Regional Corporation.

Mr. Speaker, what really forced me to raise this matter this afternoon is when people from Caroni village came to me and told me they met the hon. Minister, Member for Arouca North, at a function and they asked him about getting some URP jobs and his answer to them was, he does not know what is happening in URP because—some name he called and told them they must go and ask that person. Mr. Speaker, I thought that this was indeed something extremely sad where you have a minister in an area, somebody approaches him and he does not know what is happening in his ministry.

What this meeting was about with me is, they asked me if we should go back to the days of the Poolools or the Joey Ramiahs so that they too could now get jobs as Mark Guerra and company did in the Laventille area. When this came to me I was shocked, but then the reality hit home, Mr. Speaker, that to really survive in this country under the PNM you must be a violent person—these people came to me very, very frustrated. For the last 14 months, they have had nothing to do and even when you go to the Ministry of Local Government, no employment. The Community-Based Protection and Enhancement Programme (CEPEP) they keep boasting about, there are about two or three CEPEP gangs in the constituency which will hire 30 people at most, and these are permanent employees. So you understand what is happening with the social sector in the constituency of Chaguanas and indeed Central and South Trinidad, Mr. Speaker?

When I was reminded about the days of Poolool—and we all know them, we all know Joey Ramiah—I went back, Mr. Ganga Singh, the hon. Member for Caroni East, and myself, we met and discussed, “How are we going to get these people—wean them away from drugs and the ugly life of crime?” We started to work in Walker Park and other areas to get the people to think positively. We had, in each one of these areas, URP gangs to assist the unemployed. We ensured that we built the three community centres in these villages. *[Interruption]*

Mr. Speaker, these villages have a history of violence and when I was reminded of it—and if you remember before 1995 you know about the Joey Ramiahs, you know about all these people, King and so on who were from these villages, and now that the people are thinking like this, I have to bring it to the attention of Parliament because what do we have?

The hapless minister, Mr. Speaker, is in charge of a corrupt URP with “Mark Guerras” receiving hundreds of thousands of dollars and nothing is filtering to the

people. I reported in this Parliament about ghost gangs in the Chaguanas borough. [Interruption] I wrote the Prime Minister, where Lindsay Parmeshwar, the person who fought against MP Ganga Singh, reported that her life was threatened because of what she did. She made a mistake. She reported to the minister that there are certain elements in the Chaguanas area who are in charge of ghost gangs and the minister went back and told these rogue elements that the shadow MP has reported them to him. [Interruption]

Mr. Speaker, the *TnT Mirror* and I quoted that in a letter I wrote to the Prime Minister. She was threatened by these people. It was her very own PNM colleague. Who are we on this side? We have no protection to talk about this, Mr. Speaker. I am warning this honourable House and I am warning the country to be very careful of what is happening by creating people who might soon be socially displaced and when this happens it could lead to violence. You are talking about when we assumed government under our Prime Minister we talked about sustainable development, how could we get our people to become people who will not depend on what is happening. Of course, we did not succeed a great deal because of what happened in our politics but today I am extremely saddened that people could think this thought to come to me and say, “MP, do you want to go back to the Poolools? Do you want to go back to the Joey Ramiahs?”

I warn this honourable House and I ask the Member of Parliament for Arouca North, if he is not in control, all he could do is offer his resignation to the Prime Minister and say “Look, I cannot” or “I do not want to be in charge of URP”, but, if you are in control, let URP—it is taxpayers’ money, Mr. Speaker. You have CEPEP, \$400 million we heard per year, and this is sustained by the Government and if you look at the employees—if I went to read through this, Mr. Speaker, you would understand what I am talking about. We received a list of URP employees and I am sure you would read it because you read everything that is lodged in this House but, Mr. Speaker, just to go back to the letter I wrote to the Prime Minister on February 27, 2003 I will quote one:

“Let me quickly remind you why I use the terms illegal...”

That is illegal hiring:

“despite many attempts to get the Minister to answer if there were any advertisements or any interviews for these positions, I am not yet convinced there were any. As far as discrimination goes, check this out...”

Mr. Prime Minister:

“only one race was hired...”

Employment Practices
[MR. RAMSARAN]

Friday, April 11, 2003

Or supporters of one political party.

“as I told you before had this done in reverse under Mr. Panday in San Juan/Laventille, the cry would have been loud—‘racist, racism’ etc, but now in Chaguanas...”

Well, “No big thing.”

So, Mr. Speaker, we are chasing a people into a corner. Unemployment—when people would read about this great deal by the Member for Diego Martin Central about how he cannot sustain Caroni (1975) Limited, what would happen to the people in the central regions? What will happen to the people who do not belong to the People’s National Movement? [*Interruption*] This is because CEPEP is for that and all the other programmes, and the Prime Minister boasted that he will take care of his people. What about the other half of Trinidad and Tobago Mr. Speaker?

So I call on—I know I call him hapless, sometimes helpless, because when I read about what is happening with the “Mark Guerras” and so on, and what they take home and what kind of car they drive, I am sure the minister will have to cower in a corner and remain there. However, the fact is that you have the responsibility in Cabinet and I ask you to do whatever you could and let the Prime Minister and the Cabinet of the day understand that you cannot afford to treat parts of the country like this because I fear for the return of the people’s names that I have called.

I tell you, Mr. Speaker, this was not an idle threat because when the people came to me, they were very, very serious and their thinking was, to get a job in the Government of Trinidad and Tobago today you have to be with the people and we have more. I am sure the MP knows them all, those who are in Chaguanas too. “These are the people who will get job.” You could call their names, Mr. Speaker, but I do not want to do that this afternoon because—well, he will read the *Hansard* because he reported his own colleague.

Imagine this, Mr. Speaker. You think about the danger that Ms. Lindsay Parmeshwar would have been in, going to the minister and saying, “These people have threatened me, you know, these people have done”—and you go back and tell the people.

Mr. Ramnath: She deserved that.

Mr. M. Ramsaran: Mr. Speaker, [*Interruption*] think about it.

Mr. Ramnath: She went PNM. She has a right to suffer.

Mr. M. Ramsaran: This is the kind of minister we have in charge of URP, which is a social programme, and I call on the Government to let good sense prevail and “doh gi’ mih no politics about we doh know about Couva”. We have two people here and two people there.

Mr. Speaker, what has happened? Prior to 1995 when I assumed office as the Member of Parliament for Chaguanas, there were three URP gangs in the constituency of Chaguanas under our watch and when you compare that with the other areas—400 URP gangs—I have no problem with that, but three in Chaguanas, one in Couva North! I remember that. I went through the figures. You know, when we revised it, at least Chaguanas reached about 20, 25, which is still not close to 200 or 300 in the East-West Corridor, but we understand their argument of social displacement and so on, so we accepted that but today the reverse is taking place and I tell you, I would not sit as the Member of Parliament for Chaguanas and allow our people to become deviant because they cannot get a job. If I cannot do it, Mr. Speaker, so be it.

Thank you very much. [*Desk thumping*]

The Minister of Local Government (Hon. Jarrette Narine): [*Desk thumping*] Mr. Speaker, I came here this afternoon having received correspondence at the Ministry indicating that a Motion entitled “Non-implementation of the Unemployment Relief Programme in the Constituency of Chaguanas” was to be debated. This is what was written by the Speaker. [*Interruption*] Well, you said nothing in accordance with this. [*Interruption*] He spoke about all kinds of things, however, in keeping with this Motion on the Adjournment, I have heard nothing but I am going to reply to what he said.

The understanding here is that the Member for Chaguanas is actually living in the past. He is feeling that the UNC is still the government of Trinidad and Tobago, which is not so. [*Interruption*] He has a lot of things that he reads in newspapers that give concocted kinds of figures and so on, comes in Parliament and speaks about it and this afternoon I would like to lay to rest some of the things that he has said. The first thing he said is that there was \$140 million in URP. This is what took place for six years in the UNC. They put \$150 million and more per year and—[*Words Expunged*]

Mr. Ramsaran: On a point of order. [*Interruption*]

Mr. Speaker: Please, please, please hon. Member. I would have that expunged from the record. Do not refer to a previous Member who we all know you are talking about. That matter is before the court. Please do not refer to that.

Mr. Ramnath: You have no shame!

Hon. J. Narine: You have no shame [*Interruption*] because this Government—[*Interruption*]

Mr. Speaker: Order please! Order please! I would like the Member to make his contribution, you know, give him some silence.

Hon. J. Narine: This Government, Mr. Speaker, inherited—after spending almost one billion dollars in six years under URP, nothing was done—[*Desk thumping*]—almost nothing. [*Desk thumping*] They gave out contracts for a programme that was supposed to put food on people's tables. Almost three-quarters of a million dollars was given out into contracts and places like Burkett corner, where a chairman of local government lost his life, \$1.4 million to build one hard-surface court. [*Desk thumping*] That is what took place under their watch! [*Interruption*]

They gave \$1.2 million to a place called Fullerton village where they built a little fishing depot [*Desk thumping*] which should have cost \$200,000. [*Interruption*] Right now the Members of Parliament for Siparia and Fyzabad will tell you that I have my quantity surveyors out in the field looking at those projects [*Interruption*] because in Siparia they tried to fool Jarrette Narine. I am very much experienced in government. [*Interruption*] When you put [*Desk thumping*] on the first page “Repairs to the Member of Parliament office in Siparia”, [*Interruption*] and then on the fourth page you put the same amount with the same contractor, saying that it is the nurses' quarters opposite Debe/Penal market, “I know is the same building”.

Mr. Ramsaran: How will that help the people in Chaguanas?

Hon. J. Narine: [*Desk thumping*] “I know is the same building.” [*Desk thumping*] When the Member for Fyzabad takes money out of the programme to fix an office there and to use a company that was close to him, enough said about that, but I am coming to some of the points that you raised. [*Interruption*]

You would have been here when we discussed the budget of 2002 and 2003. The Unemployment Relief Programme got \$136 million, \$11 million of which went to Tobago, not \$140 million. We have accountability and transparency and I am certain that nobody on this side will end up behind bars. [*Interruption*] [*Desk thumping*] [*Interruption*] “The amount ah lies—and we are not finished, you know. [*Interruption*] You doh speak, you know! [*Interruption*] You doh speak, you know!” You are the one who caused the problem. “You talking about Lindsay Parmeshwar!” You are the one who caused the problem for Mr. Sumairsingh.

[*Interruption*] You caused the problem [*Desk thumping*] because you reported what took place in the corporation with the minutes of the meeting to the minister who was in charge of the ministry at the time, thinking that he would have come to take away Nariva seat from you. [*Interruption*] That is the kind of people you have on that side. [*Interruption*]

Let me say this. The reports that you have read in the newspaper [*Interruption*] are that [*Interruption*] the former candidate for the PNM in Caroni East [*Interruption*] had some information and started to investigate for herself [*Interruption*] and reported the matter to the police. When the police started to investigate, everybody must know! You have to write a letter to the Prime Minister to say—the Prime Minister is not involved in that. Our Prime Minister is a decent man, [*Desk thumping*] an honourable man; [*Interruption*] very honest, [*Interruption*] and if they start to investigate and call people at home to find out where they are working, “Jarrette Narine have nothing to do with that! [*Desk thumping*] So you continue to read *Probe* and the *Trinidad and Tobago Mirror*.” [*Interruption*] I am not going to stand here and allow Members on that side to give lies to the community of Trinidad and Tobago. [*Desk thumping*] [*Interruption*]

Why did you not go by the mayor when he bought the gun off of the taxpayers’ money in Chaguanas? [*Interruption*] You talking about crime? [*Interruption*] “Da” is what cause the problem in Tunapuna and it will come out. [*Interruption*] Take the government vehicle, do not put a sign on it and driving all over the place. [*Interruption*] The vehicle is parked under his house every night. [*Interruption*] You know that? “You wouldn’ know dat. It ain’ ha no sign on it,” [*Interruption*] but let me say this, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: One minute, please? One minute, please? [*Interruption*] Members, not because the hon. Member has a powerful voice it means that you all can raise your voices in trying to outdo him. Please, let him continue in peace.

Hon. J. Narine: Mr. Speaker—[*Interruption*] Mr. Speaker—[*Interruption*]

Mr. Ramnath: Get to the point.

Hon. J. Narine: Mr. Speaker, I was a trade-unionist and I stood and used to speak to 200 persons without a mike so “it comes natural to me”.

What happened—[*Interruption*] “Yeah, you go ahead. The first enquiry they have into WASA you wouldn’ be sitting there.” [*Desk thumping*]

Mr. Speaker—[*Interruption*] Mr. Speaker—[*Interruption*]—this whole thing started about February of last year, [*Interruption*] while the programme was not

Employment Practices
[MR. NARINE]

Friday, April 11, 2003

transferred from the Ministry of Labour to the Ministry of Local Government. The Chaguanas Borough Corporation, through the previous government, the UNC people, took a decision to remove the office from Chaguanas. *[Interruption]* It is here and I will read this newspaper clipping, “Chaguanas gets URP in January”. The mayor came to me and said the original decision to transfer the URP office to Couva—and “it wasn’t transferred to Couva”. Couva had an office. We transferred the operations from Chaguanas to Couva and we took care of that area from Couva. *[Interruption]*

The indication was that persons who had to come from far off had difficulties to reach Couva instead of Chaguanas. That was the problem. What happened is that they moved a motion and they decided to move the office out of their compound and it is written here.

“The original decision to transfer the URP office to Couva, was taken by the former administration, when it was under the Ministry of Labour, admitted Nagessar.”

Who is the mayor of Chaguanas—admitted. *[Interruption]* Look, it is here, and he never defended this!

“The office at the Chaguanas Corporation was then used to house the Chaguanas Municipal Police...”

[Interruption] All year last year nobody had a problem! *[Interruption]*

Mr. Speaker: Please, please, please! Hon. Members, we only have about eight more minutes. Please? Members on the Government Benches, Members on the Opposition Benches please, let the Member make his contribution.

Hon. J. Narine: I need to get some injury time, Sir. I am appealing to you. What happened at that time was that in the last budget debate the Member of Parliament for Chaguanas raised with the Prime Minister the fact that there was no longer an office in the Chaguanas area because we deal by regions. Two weeks ago the same Member of Parliament asked a written question here, what we had in the 14 regional corporations of URP, and that question was answered in writing to state that we were not using the 14 regional corporations. Last year we had 11 regions. This year we have 12 regions because we have made Chaguanas a region. If we had to put a URP office in every constituency, then we will have to have 34 regions in Trinidad. So it is impossible to do that—the regions there.

So that on October 16, 2002 Mr. Manning was written to by the Mayor of Chaguanas. *[Interruption]* The Mayor of Chaguanas indicated to the Prime

Minister how important it was to relocate the office to the area, not to the borough, because we have no region by boroughs. We have regions and I can tell you that region takes in Couva North, Caroni East and Chaguanas. Subsequent to that, we met and by a newspaper report we had agreed that if he will give back the office to the Unemployment Relief Programme, we would start it in January. This is known to the people. The mayor then wrote a letter on December 04, 2002 “Reintroduction of Unemployment Relief Programme to...Chaguanas”.

“I refer to our recent discussions on the above subject, which has culminated in your favourable consideration and decision that with effect from January 2003, the Unemployment Relief Programme will once again operate from an office within the boundaries of the Chaguanas Borough.”

[*Interruption*] That is the office he talked about. This is a letter from your mayor. [*Interruption*] No, because I am going to say what happened because this is the Motion. What you said about Joey Ramiah and all that—[*Interruption*]—Joey Ramiah? [*Interruption*] “I go talk about Joey Ramiah? If you used to hug him up, you could hug up 10 “Mark Guerras”. [*Interruption*] If you could ah hug up Joey Ramiah, you could hug up 10 “Mark Guerras”. [*Interruption*] You understand? So the mayor wrote indicating he was satisfied. [*Interruption*]

Subsequent to that, the mayor wrote asking to get certain persons employed. Serena Ramjattan, Indira Henry, Haroon Ali, Deonarine Ragoobar, Amelia Sieunarine, Indira Harricharan, Ramnawar Maharaj—no address, no telephone number, no ID card numbers, nothing. [*Interruption*] The Mayor of Chaguanas—this is the letter—and he was asking for assistance.

So that, I have with me a report—[*Interruption*] Nothing is wrong with the names because I only employ human beings in our programme, not this side or that side, [*Desk thumping*] Trinidadians, citizens of Trinidad and Tobago [*Desk thumping*] and if you want to start getting—[*Interruption*] “Eh?”

Mr. Ramsaran: “Leh we read dese names. We go see if they are human beings.”

Hon. J. Narine: Who is “dat”?

Mr. Ramnath: You have betrayed your heritage. [*Interruption*]

Hon. Members: Oooooooooo! Ahhhhhhhhh!

6.00 p.m.

Hon. J. Narine: Mr. Speaker, may I go ahead, because I have other things to say. I will not listen to crosstalk. [*Crosstalk*] You do not know anything about your heritage. [*Crosstalk*]

[*Hindi spoken*] [*Crosstalk*]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please! Hon. Minister, the Standing Orders do not provide for a language other than English, so having used those Hindi words, you now have to translate. [*Desk thumping*]

Hon. J. Narine: Mr. Speaker, I was about to do so. I said, in a nutshell:

“Once God is on my side, my enemies will lie at my feet.”

[*Desk thumping*] [*Laughter*]

That is where you are and that is where you will remain.

Mr. Partap: You think God sleeping?

Hon. J. Narine: Mr. Speaker, I have a list of persons working in the office at Chaguanas since January of this year. I also have a list of the projects and the number of persons who worked on them from January until now. The Member talked about the Montrose River. [*Crosstalk*]

Which ghost gang? “You ever went in the Montrose River?” “You ever went to the back of the junior secondary school in Lange Park?” I am talking about a region. “What happen to your constituency? What happen to their constituency?” You are a selfish man! My constituency? I have no constituency. I represent the people of Trinidad and Tobago. [*Desk thumping*] I won the election by 14,000 votes in a constituency, but when I am here, I represent the people of Trinidad and Tobago. [*Desk thumping*] You could come and “fight” me anytime. If I am not “fighting”, I will put somebody to beat you, [*Desk thumping*] in any constituency. I am talking about elections.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Member, I am just informing you that you have two more minutes, inclusive of injury time.

Hon. J. Narine: Mr. Speaker, there are 13 projects in Chaguanas, and those that were completed already. At present, there are 10 projects in Caroni Central and about 16 projects in—I will give it to you after; I do not have much time. I will give you this copy to look at. [*Crosstalk*] Why must I tour with you? “I fraid de badjohns down dey.” Your friends are Joey Ramiah, “Robo Cop” and all those others. [*Desk thumping*] Why must I come and tour with you? I do not align myself with those types of people.

Mr. Partap: But you have Mark Guerra “fellas” to protect you.

Hon. J. Narine: Mr. Speaker, 725 males were employed and 523 females. Those are our records. I am not lying to you. We have spent a grand total of

\$792,000 with a breakdown of one, two, three fortnights, \$152,000; \$155,000, \$160,000; \$3,850 was for watchmen and cleaners during that period; six and seven fortnights, \$159,350; \$136,710. [*Crosstalk*] “Dey will ketch you planting weed just now. Where yuh does plant weed, look out.” [*Interruption*]

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Member, your speaking time has expired.

Question put and agreed to.

House adjourned accordingly.

Adjourned at 6.05 p.m.

WRITTEN ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Unemployment Relief Programme (2002)

76. Mr. Chandresh Sharma (*Fyzabad*) asked the Minister of Local Government:

Could the Minister provide a list of all persons employed on a monthly basis in the Unemployment Relief Programme (URP) for 2002 and the place of employment?

The Minister of Local Government (Hon. Jarrette Narine): For the fiscal year 2001/2002 there were 320 monthly paid employees in the Unemployment Relief Programme who were distributed among the following places of employment:

HEAD OFFICE (Core Programme)

NO.	NAME	POSITION
1.	Thomas George	Programme Manager
2.	Mervyn Collins	Special Projects Co-ordinator
3.	Uric Williams	Regional Manager
4.	Rachanoedin Andi-Abdoerrachman	Engineer
5.	Shivon Davis	Engineer
6.	Anthony Spencer	Regional Supervisor
7.	Mervyn Telfer	Research Analyst
8.	Cathy-Anne Brown	Materials Supervisor
9.	Petra Graham	Accounting Assistant

NO.	NAME	POSITION
10.	Steve Valere	Engineering Assistant
11.	Herbert John	Engineering Assistant
12.	Rennie Paul	Engineering Assistant
13.	Charles Gray	Engineering Assistant
14.	Vishnu Ramhit	Engineering Assistant
15.	Gordon Sampson	Engineering Assistant
16.	Brensley Mc Kenzie	Engineering Assistant
17.	Wardah Marshall	Costing Officer
18.	Anthony Barrow	Costing Officer
19.	Michael Pemberton	Costing Officer
20.	Jaimini Pargass	Costing Officer
21.	Ted Boodoosingh	Costing Officer
22.	Ellis Daniel	U.R.P. Computerization Co-ordinator
23.	Javid Ali	U.R.P. Computerization Assistant
24.	Yantee Persad	U.R.P. Computerization Assistant
25.	Karlene Chapman	Clerical Officer
26.	Cheddar George	Data Entry Clerk
27.	Krystal Leah Regis	Data Entry Clerk
28.	Carla Sobers	Clerk/Typist
29.	Marlene Thomas	Clerk/Typist

WOMEN'S PROGRAMME HEAD OFFICE

NO.	NAME	POSITION
1.	Margo Thomas	Regional Co-ordinator

NO.	NAME	POSITION
2.	Verna Thomas	Regional Co-ordinator
3.	Veda Superville	Regional Co-ordinator
4.	Judy Arismandez	Regional Co-ordinator
5.	Irma Sandy	Regional Co-ordinator
6.	Claudia James	Regional Co-ordinator
7.	Eunice Murray	Regional Co-ordinator
8.	Elizabeth Jones	Regional Co-ordinator
9.	Carla Williams	Regional Co-ordinator
10.	Rosemarie Bernard	Regional Co-ordinator
11.	Anasthesia Hernandez	Regional Co-ordinator
12.	Jacqueline Timothy	Regional Co-ordinator
13.	Linda Chase	Regional Co-ordinator
14.	Barbara Ryan	Regional Co-ordinator
15.	Cynthia Blake	Regional Co-ordinator
16.	Ronnie La Borde	Regional Co-ordinator
17.	Susan Medrano St. Louis	Regional Co-ordinator
18.	Alberta Lawrence	Regional Co-ordinator
19.	Debeta Flemming	Regional Co-ordinator
20.	Phyllis Ramnath	Regional Co-ordinator
21.	Margaret Valentine	Regional Co-ordinator
22.	Christine Neptune	Regional Co-ordinator
23.	Deborah Gilead	Regional Co-ordinator
24.	Claudia Mc Guire	Regional Co-ordinator
25.	Umilta Saunders	Regional Co-ordinator
26.	Yvonne Gobin	Regional Co-ordinator

NO.	NAME	POSITION
27.	Jacqueline Short	Regional Co-ordinator
28.	Sharon Felix	Regional Co-ordinator
29.	Cammille Williams	Regional Co-ordinator
30.	Virginia Wilson	Regional Co-ordinator
31.	Natasha Lyn Baptiste	Regional Co-ordinator
32.	Grace Guy	Regional Co-ordinator
33.	Helen Mahase Blake	Regional Co-ordinator
34.	Nathalie Trim	Data Entry Clerk
35.	June Mitchell	Data Entry Clerk
36.	Shirleen Cooper	Regional Co-ordinator
37.	Margaret Barrington	Regional Co-ordinator

COUVA

NO.	NAME	POSITION
1.	Irvin Bobb	Regional Manager
2.	Phillip A. Edwards	Regional Supervisor
3.	Kenneth Anthony	Regional Supervisor
4.	Roger Bridgeman	Regional Supervisor
5.	Roy Joseph	Regional Co-ordinator
6.	Vashtee Salickram	Regional Co-ordinator
7.	Angela Francois	Regional Co-ordinator
8.	Bernadette Nicholls	Regional Co-ordinator
9.	Wendell Brewster	Regional Co-ordinator
10.	Vashti Gay	Materials Supervisor
11.	Karen Sobion Paul	Materials Supervisor
12.	Mohammed Bryan Ali	Assistant Accountant

NO.	NAME	POSITION
13.	Frankie Ramcharan	Engineer Assistant
14.	Indar Parasram	Recruitment Officer
15.	George Lakhan	Stores Clerk
16.	Colin Shand	Stores Clerk
17.	Nisha Luke	Data Entry Clerk
18.	Kameila Parsan	Accounts Clerk
19.	Alicia Lawrence	Clerical Officer
20.	Judy Bailey	Clerical Officer
21.	Roxanne Modeste	Clerical Officer
22.	Salisha Burkredan	Clerical Officer
23.	Indar Kamal	Clerical Officer
24.	Carl Naranjit	Clerical Officer
25.	Cheryl Jack	Clerical Officer

SAN FERNANDO

NO.	NAME	POSITION
1.	Roy Davis	Regional Manager
2.	Jeffrey Maynard	Regional Supervisor
3.	Wayne Lewis	Regional Supervisor
4.	Thomas Tannis	Regional Supervisor
5.	Erica Taylor	Regional Supervisor
6.	Paul Waithe	Regional Supervisor
7.	Stephen Joseph	Regional Co-ordinator
8.	Michael Mayers	Regional Co-ordinator
9.	Russell Wilson	Regional Co-ordinator
10.	Annette Valdez	Recruitment Officer

NO.	NAME	POSITION
11.	Catherine Weekes	Assistant Accountant
12.	Christine Ali	Data Entry Clerk
13.	Natalie Brereton	Data Entry Clerk
14.	Ann Marie Granger	Accounts Clerk
15.	Cecelia Joseph	Accounts Clerk
16.	Roselle Joseph	Clerical Officer
17.	Karlene Cooper	Clerical Officer
18.	Audrey Campbell-Walcott	Clerical Officer
19.	Keisha Crystal Garcia	Clerical Officer
20.	Janelle Reuben	Clerical Officer
21.	Claunise Bernard	Clerical Officer
22.	Tricia Maynard	Clerical Officer

POINT FORTIN

1.	Learie Neale	Regional Manager
2.	Aldron Howell	Regional Manager
3.	Neville St. John.	Regional Supervisor
4.	Victor Roberts	Regional Supervisor
5.	Eric Felix	Material Supervisor
6.	Remy Montano	Engineering Assistant
7.	Patrick Taylor	Engineering Assistant
8.	Denise Joseph	Regional Co-ordinator
9.	Leonard C. Hinds	Regional Co-ordinator
10.	Roger Salazar	Regional Co-ordinator
11.	Mary Gooding	Assistant Accountant
12.	Ingrid Ottley	Recruitment Officer

*Written Answers to Questions**Friday, April 11, 2003*

NO.	NAME	POSITION
13.	Jennifer Pathay	Data Entry 1
14.	Fabiola Chacon	Data Entry 2
15.	Ardelene Gayah	Accounts Clerk
16.	Nneka Ogis	Accounts Clerk
17.	Kathleen Chan	Accounts Clerk
18.	Margaret Garvin Williams	Clerical Officer
19.	Bernadine Billy	Clerical Officer
20.	Renee Tobias	Clerical Officer
21.	Sheriffa Renne	Clerical Officer
22.	Cheryl-Ann Narcis	Clerical Officer
23.	Ayne Fortune	Stores Clerk

RIO CLARO

NO.	NAME	POSITION
1.	Roger Bholai	Regional Manager
2.	Lloyd S. Huggins	Regional Supervisor
3.	Elitha Bessor	Regional Co-ordinator
4.	Paul Montique	Material Supervisor
5.	Arnold Sankar	Engineering Assistant
6.	John Reviero	Engineering Surveyor
7.	Pearl Ottley	Accountant Assistant
8.	Margot Joseph	Recruitment Officer
9.	Marianna Mendez	Data Entry Clerk
10.	Abna Mohammed	Data Entry Clerk
11.	Judy Lambert	Stores Clerk
12.	Dooliena Barsatee	Accounts Clerk

NO.	NAME	POSITION
13.	Safiya Worrel	Accounts Clerk
14.	Cheryl Asseveiro	Clerical Officer
15.	Bernadette Jarvis	Clerical Officer
16.	Wendy Charles	Clerical Officer
17.	Clear Lenore Rodriguese	Clerical Officer
18.	Patria V. Gilbert-Humphrey	Clerical Officer

PRINCES TOWN

NO.	NAME	POSITION
1.	Ispahani Ali	Regional Manager
2.	Frank Ramsaran	Regional Co-ordinator
3.	Khemchand Seetaram	Regional Co-ordinator
4.	Lenorad Pollaydore	Regional Supervisor
5.	Ezra Mondesir	Regional Supervisor
6.	Pearl James	Regional Co-ordinator
7.	Cathy-Ann Alonzo	Materials Supervisor
8.	Gerald Maharaj	Material Supervisor
9.	Seulal Sahadeo	Engineering Assistant
10.	Rennie Loknath	Engineering Assistant
11.	Valerie Huggins	Recruitment Officer
12.	Rampyari Emrit	Assistant Accountant
13.	Neila Persadsingh	Assistant Accountant
14.	Terri Parag	Data Entry Clerk
15.	Anita Deonarine Singh	Accounts Clerk
16.	Shivon Scepe	Accounts Clerk
17.	Lisa Dindial	Clerical Officer

NO.	NAME	POSITION
18.	Della Benjamin	Clerical Officer
19.	Indira Jagessar	Clerical Officer
20.	Sharon Des Vignes Dyer	Clerical Officer
21.	Adriana Haynes	Clerical Officer
22.	Pamela Haynes	Clerical Officer
23.	Rosemarie Teesdale	Clerical Officer
24.	Sally-Ann Ramnath	Clerical Officer

DIEGO MARTIN

NO.	NAME	POSITION
1	Clay Thomas	Regional Manager
2	Adnan Abdul Al-adil	Regional Supervisor
3	Moses Duncan	Regional Supervisor
4	Andrew Brown	Regional Co-ordinator
5	Lionel Giroux	Regional Co-ordinator
6	Charmaine Lamy	Material Supervisor
7	Michelle Goodridge	Material Supervisor
8	Dhelia Prichard	Assistant Accountant
9	Natalie Allen	Recruiting Officer
10	Isam Alimayu	Engineering Surveyor
11	Andrew Stephen	Engineering Assistant
12	Cheryl Ann Edwards	Stores Clerk
13	Tajill King	Data Entry Clerk
14	Shirley Timothy	Clerical Officer
15	Francine Edwards	Clerical Officer
16	Allison Wint	Clerical Officer

*Written Answers to Questions**Friday, April 11, 2003*

NO.	NAME	POSITION
17	Leslyn Carrington	Clerical Officer
18	Michelle Lopez	Clerical Officer
19	Donna Lewis	Clerical Officer
20	Onika Walker-Joseph	Clerical Officer
21	Roxanne Braithwaite	Clerical Officer
22	Stanley Job	Regional Supervisor
23	Francis Ragoo	Regional Co-ordinator
24	Thomas Le Platte	Stores Clerk
25	Stacy Ann Evans	Data Entry Clerk
26	Stacy Cayonne	Clerical Officer
27	Robert Millington	Engineering Assistant

PORT OF SPAIN

NO.	NAME	POSITION
1	Louis Carl Antoine	Regional Manager
2	Mark Guerra	Regional Supervisor
3	Lance Lashley	Regional Supervisor
4	Christine Levia	Regional Supervisor
5	William Thomas	Regional Supervisor
6	Khalilah Abdal-Adil	Material Supervisor
7	Marcus Jules	Material Supervisor
8	Leeford Layne	Material Supervisor
9	Don Faray	Regional Co-ordinator
10	Anthony Kinsale	Regional Co-ordinator
11	Kent Taylor	Regional Co-ordinator
12	Cetewayo Murai	Engineering Assistant

NO.	NAME	POSITION
13	Eldon Ross	Engineering Assistant
14	Angus Baptiste	Engineering Assistant
15	Dennis Kirk	Engineering Surveyor
16	Mansie Williams	Assistant Accountant
17	Gloria Jones	Recruiting Officer
18	Joesan Stewart	Data Entry Clerk
19	Aretha Sandy	Data Entry Clerk
20	Sonia Gomez	Stores Clerk
21	Brenda Boucaud	Accounts Clerk
22	Charlene De Peza	Accounts Clerk
23	Iva Joseph	Clerical Officer
24	Aretha Attalle	Clerical Officer
25	Gerald Bando	Clerical Officer
26	Marjorie Drakes	Clerical Officer
27	Janelle Bernard	Clerical Officer
28	John Carter	Regional Supervisor

TUNAPUNA

NO	NAME	POSITION
1	Mervyn Theadore	Regional Manager
2	Anthony Williams	Regional Supervisor
3	Barry Garcia	Regional Supervisor
4	Ronald St. John	Regional Supervisor
5	Everest Rose	Material Supervisor
6	Hasan Anyabwile	Material Supervisor
7	David Sealy	Regional Co-ordinator

*Written Answers to Questions**Friday, April 11, 2003*

NO	NAME	POSITION
8	Ruby Lewis	Regional Co-ordinator
9	Anthony Theodore Parris	Regional Co-ordinator
10	Rawle Joseph	Regional Co-ordinator
11	Hasley Jordan	Engineering Assistant
12	Roy Gomez	Engineering Surveyor
13	Natasha Fortune	Data Entry Clerk
14	Quceita Mc Lean	Data Entry Clerk
15	Byron Lambert	Assistant Accountant
16	Joy Robinson	Accounts Clerk
17	Racquel Smith	Accounts Clerk
18	Charlene Hinkson	Clerical Officer
19	Stacy Eastman	Clerical Officer
20	Leslie Ann Fortune	Clerical Officer
21	Judy Daniels	Clerical Officer
22	Savatri Ramchait	Clerical Officer
23	Lauren Banwell	Regional Supervisor

ARIMA

NO	NAME	POSITION
1	Trevor St. Louis	Regional Manager
2	Curtis Winter	Regional Supervisor
3	Leroy Prentice	Regional Supervisor
4	Clint Moses	Regional Supervisor
5	Kevin Reviere	Material Supervisor
6	Terrence Williams	Material Supervisor
7	Carl Worrell	Regional Co-ordinator

*Written Answers to Questions**Friday, April 11, 2003*

NO	NAME	POSITION
8	Franklyn Browne	Regional Co-ordinator
9	Lionel Adrian Beckles	Regional Co-ordinator
10	Ken Tracey	Regional Co-ordinator
11	Mervyn Farrell	Engineering Assistant
12	Bruce Simon	Engineering Surveyor
13	Prahalad Rampat	Assistant Accountant
14	Lloyd Theodore	Stores Clerk
15	Lisa De Lecia	Accounts Clerk
16	Tricia Jobent	Accounts Clerk
17	Brenda Carr	Clerical Officer
18	Rachel Briggs	Clerical Officer

SANGRE GRANDE

NO	NAME	POSITION
1	Peter A. Ford	Regional Manager
2	Leslie Henry	Regional Supervisor
3	Cuthbert Pierre	Regional Supervisor
4	Lloyd Williams	Regional Supervisor
5	Eric Alfred	Regional Co-ordinator
6	Shelton Lewis	Material Supervisor
7	Carol Hernandez	Material Supervisor
8	David Lewis	Engineering Assistant
9	Kenrick Castellano	Engineering Surveyor
10	Callan Suepaul	Assistant Accountant
11	Germaine Locario	Recruiting Officer
12	Angelique John	Data Entry Clerk

NO	NAME	POSITION
13	Indrawatti Ramnanan	Data Entry Clerk
14	Paula Phillip	Accounts Clerk
15	Hazel Sanchez	Accounts Clerk
16	Margaret Hernandez	Accounts Clerk
17	Ann-Marie Charles	Clerical Officer
18	Pamela Duncan Superville	Clerical Officer
19	Marlene Roberts	Clerical Officer
20	Judith Headley	Clerical Officer
21	Ria Ali	Clerical Officer
22	Gilda Charles	Clerical Officer
23	Thelca De La Rosa	Clerical Officer
24	Nicole Gentle	Clerical Officer

SAN JUAN

NO	NAME	POSITION
1	Carlton Taylor	Regional Manager
2	Mc Donald Padmore	Regional Supervisor
3	John Martin Diamond	Regional Supervisor
4	James Morris	Regional Supervisor
5	Wilfred Brazier	Material Supervisor
6	Duha Abdullah	Material Supervisor
7	Fitzroy Thomas	Regional Co-ordinator
8	Joseph David	Regional Co-ordinator
9	Cheridan Woodruffe	Regional Co-ordinator
10	Garth Collymore	Engineering Assistant
11	Godfrey Feracho	Engineering Surveyor

NO	NAME	POSITION
12	Nazim Mohammed	Assistant Accountant
13	Margaret Garcia	Recruiting Officer
14	Alicia Greaves	Data Entry Clerk
15	Abdul Ghafur	Stores Clerk
16	Yvette Thomas	Accounts Clerk
17	Lenore Alexis	Accounts Clerk
18	Kim Ambrose	Clerical Officer
19	Herma Solomon-Greaves	Clerical Officer
20	Angela Burmant	Clerical Officer
21	Shameen Wong	Clerical Officer
22	Christine Prime	Clerical Officer

**Unemployment Relief Programme
(Suppliers of Goods and Services)**

77. Mr. Chandresh Sharma (*Fyzabad*) asked the Minister of Local Government to provide a detailed list of suppliers of goods and services and amounts bought from each supplier for URP in 2002?

The Minister of Local Government (Hon. Jarrette Narine): A list of the suppliers of goods and services and amounts bought from each supplier for the Unemployment Relief Programme is as follows:

**SUMMARY LIST OF SUPPLIERS OF GOODS & SERVICES
FOR THE UNEMPLOYMENT RELIEF PROGRAMME (URP) - 2002**

NO.	NAME OF SUPPLIER	AMOUNT
1	Awardy Hardware and General Supplies	488,540.09
2	AV Drilling and Workover Limited	39,962.50
3	Archistructural Solution Trinidad Limited	16,000.00
4	Affordable Hardware and Supplies	17.25
5	Authentic Flags Manufacturing Company Limited	10,151.05

NO.	NAME OF SUPPLIER	AMOUNT
6	All Hardware and General Supplies	48,426.94
7	Ansteph's Enterprises	1,694.00
8	A. Moses and Sons Limited	21,376.93
9	Acme General Supplies	897.00
10	AA Laquis Limited	54.05
11	ADM Import and Export	568.56
12	Amalgamated Sanitation Company Limited	1,012.00
13	Automotive Components Limited	2,074.49
14	Albroscro Limited	131.05
15	BP Banjhu Block Factory	3,921.50
16	Buywise Stores Limited	430.00
17	Bakers Flags and Emblems	5,681.00
18	BK Holdings Limited	35,938.00
19	Bridge Con Limited	125,614.50
20	Bestcrete	64,742.13
21	Business Office Supplies	249.37
22	Bottles and Cans	52,000.00
23	Baldeosingh Enterprises Limited	19,200.00
24	Blue Waters Products Limited	1,542.15
25	Courts Trinidad Limited	995.00
26	Construction Services and Supplies	28,159.73
27	Celectrician Enterprises Limited	12,972.00
28	CMR & Company Limited	2,289.74
29	CR Boodosingh & Sons Limited	8,728.32
30	Central Equipment	4,485.00

NO.	NAME OF SUPPLIER	AMOUNT
31	Central Concrete Products Limited	3,507.50
32	Carib Asphalt Pavers Limited	15,670.94
33	Carribbean Packaging Industial Limited	945.30
34	Campus Corner Limited	220.00
35	Caribbean Sheet & Tubular Limited	8,372.00
36	Comfort - Cooling Limited	690.00
37	Cell V - Tech Communications	300.00
38	Deltex Artshop	1,381.15
39	D. Mahadeo & Sons Limited	8,050.00
40	Dave's General Hareware	1,076.64
41	D'Abadie Discount Mart	59,508.19
42	Eric Solis Marketing Limited	43,204.44
43	Economy Supermarket Limited	1,781.46
44	Electron Plumbing, Electrical Sales & Services	1,683.52
45	Express Newspaper	4,207.29
46	Firearms Training Institution Limited	402.50
47	Fresh Cuts Meats Supermarket	779.01
48	Fire Fighting Protection and Equipment Services	460.00
49	Franks General Contracting Limited	8,855.00
50	Guardian Newspaper Limited	538.20
51	HI Tech Fluid Power Limited	2,486.06
52	HILO Stores	2,000.00
53	Heller Chemicals Limited	940.15
54	H&A Supplies Company Limited	23,177.40
55	Inter Trading Company Limited	61,803.18

NO.	NAME OF SUPPLIER	AMOUNT
56	ILLuminat	20,436.83
57	Imjin's Security Services	379,462.05
58	J. Kasmally's Farm Garden	2,210.00
59	Jenny's Work	1,518.00
60	June Sandy	134.00
61	JN. Nath's Furniture Store	3,072.00
62	J. Chai Trading Company Limited	1,253,608.14
63	Jonny P. Sound Company Limited	9,660.00
64	Kinko's Limited	425.50
65	King & Kings Supermarket Limited	186.86
66	K&H Contrcting Limited	103,663.30
67	Kenmar Marketing	2,500.00
68	Kings Landscaping Services	1,000.00
69	L.R.S. Ramcharan Hardware Company Limited	24,886.00
70	LTEC Services	2,770.20
71	Laughling & De Gannes Limited	57,143.69
72	M.T.S.	12,571.80
73	Maser Limited	209.31
74	Mervyn Appliances	1,330.55
75	Mc Enearney Business Machines	23,325.91
76	Media Sales Limited	943.35
77	Mootilal Ramhit & Sons Contracting Limited	218.155.00
78	Memory Bank Computers	3,578.00
79	Moonan Paints & General Supplies	32,271.57
80	Modesir Hardware Limited	62,386.21

NO.	NAME OF SUPPLIER	AMOUNT
81	Magic Mist Service Limited	2,429.48
82	M.N.R. Hareware Supplies Limited	29,604.45
83	M.D. Com Business & Home Furniture	11,695.50
84	Moosai's Hardware Limited	20,819.73
85	Newsday	2,355.95
86	Nagib Elias & Sons Limited	217.41
87	Northern General Holdings Limited	49,872.70
88	Nuchem Industries Limited	692.30
89	Naisa Brand Products Limited	23.30
90	Neeyanlal Persad B/Mart & General Hardware	35,919.96
91	Office Link Company Limited	191.71
92	O.C Marketing Limited	5,765.48
93	Office Innovations	152.40
94	Oilfield & Marine Sales & Services	73,177.31
95	Ogeer's Hardware	124,536.58
96	Office Are Us Limited	25,875.00
97	Purity Water	3,366.50
98	Peiping Supermarket	7,548.80
99	Pretromai Construction Service Limited	3,500.00
100	Price Master	20,911.86
101	Pigallle's Limited	490.93
102	Pereira & Company Limited	9,258.65
103	Paharry Hardware & Auto Supplies	5,717.71
104	Power Lite Products	431.26
105	Pillai's Hardware Limited	667.00

NO.	NAME OF SUPPLIER	AMOUNT
106	Pacific Construction Company	7,544.00
107	Petromar Construction Services Limited	5,600.00
108	R.J's Hardware Supplies Company	885.50
109	Ramrattan Hardware & General Supplies	4,844.95
110	Ricon Limited	107,281.20
111	R. Dhaniram & Company	1,177.21
112	Richard Ali	12,230.00
113	Pampersad Moonan Limited	32,775.00
114	Rentokil Initial	603.76
115	Ramkissoon Hardware & Electrical	305.90
116	R.S. Services Limited	38,100.00
117	Ramish & Leela Supermarket Limited	424.50
118	Ramsaray Brothers General Contracting	47,313.30
119	B. Ramkissoon's Tyre & Hardware	19,779.72
120	Reesal Hardware Limited	130,143.82
121	Romains Hardware & Bloockmart	434,649.61
122	Saison Limited	43,125.00
123	Sun Up International	6,663.60
124	S. Jagmohan & Sons Limited	9,200.00
125	Solid Construction	15,437.00
126	Summer Foods Limited	1,355.44
127	Syne's Contracting	9,384.00
128	Shiva Roopnarine	30,000.00
129	Sterlin's Electrical Supplies Limited	554.59
130	St. Lucien Hardware & Building Supplies Limited	7,243.85

NO.	NAME OF SUPPLIER	AMOUNT
131	Silica Sands Limited	38,571.01
132	Second Crossing Hardware	130,480.16
133	Tracmac Engineering	6,368.85
134	Thomas Peak & Company Limited	771.65
135	Trinidad Cement Limited	156,483.37
136	Trinidad Systems Limited	972.90
137	Tropical Tent Rentals Limited	870.03
138	Tazmool Hosein & Sons Limited	172,687.73
139	Trinidad Publishing Company Limited	5,234.54
140	Trinity Asphalt Pavers Limited	10,672.00
141	The Agritec Agricultural Supplies	1,050.00
142	The Little Cunapo Garden Shop	1,880.00
143	The Boss Stationers	101,282.24
144	Unique Books & Sports Center	342.10
145	Ultimate Construction Services Limited	45,080.00
146	Urban Desis Hardware	37,060.00
147	William H. Scott Limited	3,671.66
148	X Treme Trinidad	250.00
TOTAL		5,364,759.71

**Unemployment Relief Programme
(Motor Vehicles)**

78. Mr. Chandresh Sharma asked the Minister of Local Government to furnish this House with a list of the motor vehicles rented in 2002 for URP, the names of suppliers and amounts paid and owing to each supplier for 2002.

The Minister of Local Government (Hon. Jarrette Narine): The names of the suppliers of vehicles rented and the amounts paid and owing to each supplier for 2002 is as follows:

SUMMARY LIST OF MOTOR VEHICLES RENTED IN 2002
UNEMPLOYMENT RELIEF PROGRAMME

NO.	NAME OF SUPPLIER	VEHICLE #	AMOUNT PAID	AMOUNT OWING
1	Claude Anthony	TAY 8732	13,300.00	
3	Hassim Ali	TAF 2565, TAC 5763, TAH 1949	1,800.00	
4	Damain Ali		10,450.00	
5	Rafi Ali	TY 3257, TY 3250	12,063.00	
6	Shamad Ali	TY 3257, TY 3250	27,105.00	4,275.24
7	Tariq Ali	TAZ 8722	16,450.00	11,250.00
8	Obafemi Awolowo	TS 4225	29,450.00	
9	Chandrabali Baldeosingh	TBD 388, TBL 5543, TAB 4037, TAZ 8340	9,600.00	
10	Bartholomew's Quarry Limited	TAB 4037, TT 4246, TAG 9486, TAH 4262	100,450.00	
11	Bhim Banjhu		4,278.00	
12	Leari Baptiste	TAE 9396	45,000.00	
13	Michael Benjamin	TAZ 3436	36,975.00	
14	Cosmos Baptiste	TAK 7114	28,375.00	
15	Anslem Blake		16,940.00	
16	Fitzroy Charles		11,262.75	

Written Answers to Questions

Friday, April 11, 2003

NO.	NAME OF SUPPLIER	VEHICLE #	AMOUNT PAID	AMOUNT OWING
17	Ann Celestine	TAZ 3037	22,800.00	4,160.24
18	Cummings & Associates	RBG 6596, RBF 586, TBM 6742	54,700.00	1,945.80
19	Gabriel Cummings		1,950.00	
20	Foster Cummings	RBG 6596, TBD 4583, TBD 4448, TBB 9429	21,200.00	3,820.87
21	Bottles & Cans Limited	TAT 9029, TAJ 6429	14,400.00	25,076.59
22	Doyce	TRD 3284/TAF 2387	7,000.00	
23	Alvarez De Leon	TAA 3613	13,600.00	
24	Murray Dolloway		2,975.00	
25	Lalchan Dwarika	TAT 2234	1,250.00	
26	Marchoon David		6,350.00	
27	Louis Elvin	TBG 4903	2,750.00	
28	Len Frederick	TBC 8296	7,000.00	
29	Anil Gunness	TBL 4323, TBA 2807	26,680.00	34,323.00
30	Glenn Gajradge	TAG 9821	25,325.00	
31	Hermanie Gosine	TBH 5579, TBD 7940	381,290.00	
32	Gankrish	TAO 2372	58,800.00	5,751.61
33	Deonath Harricharan	TBJ 9990	9,775.00	

NO.	NAME OF SUPPLIER	VEHICLE #	AMOUNT PAID	AMOUNT OWING
34	Bertie Holder	TAT 7732	2,800.00	
35	Hafeeza Hosien	TAD 1194	14,070.00	
36	Anderson Hazette	TAN 8422	2,700.00	4,287.94
37	James Henry	TAD 7098	31,350.00	
38	Vernon Johnson	TAX 2229	10,500.00	6,504.40
39	Salome John	TAB 9869	6,525.00	179.11
40	Jamie Jules	TBB 9429	15,600.00	
41	S. Jagmohan & Sons Limited		9,200.00	
42	Satia Kamaarjoon	TAW 5529	7,100.00	
43	Kassim Khan	TBG 2480, TAG 9850	1,552.00	
44	Ornesto King	TBU 6742	8,250.00	1,840.00
45	King's Transport		3,000.00	
46	Quincy King	TBM 6742	2,000.00	
47	Lester Kerr	TAJ 6099	19,600.00	8,625.00
48	Carlyle Longdon	TAD 8249	14,000.00	
49	Lennox Lewis	TAG 9293	2,750.00	
50	Service Masters Industrials Service Limited	TAF 4118, TAK 5114, TBM 3142, TBM 3143, TBM 3144, TAF 8498, TBC 2823, TBM 3817, TBM 3075	1,536,914.13	175,094.52

Written Answers to Questions

Friday, April 11, 2003

NO.	NAME OF SUPPLIER	VEHICLE #	AMOUNT PAID	AMOUNT OWING
51	Sharaze A. Muredsir	TAK 3866, TAH 4254	10,150.00	
52	Zamid Mohammed	TAT 2860, TX 5391	12,950.00	979.80
53	Urban Mitchell	TBL 251, TBJ 838	69,150.00	14,444.00
54	Rampersad Moonan Limited	TBA 1872	6,900.00	3,351.67
55	Anthony Munroe	TAT 7771	8,375.00	
56	Lahochan Matasaran	TAD 1882	2,475.00	
57	Vinoor Mahadeo		3,600.00	
58	Patricia & Willis Manwaring	TAR 9996, TBG 926	25,200.00	
59	D. Manadeo & Sons Limited	TBE 1346, TAZ 8292, TBL 5422	20,056.00	6,625.00
60	Michael Transport Company Limited	TBH 5912, TBH 5728, TBF 222	8,073.00	
61	Stephen A. Mitchell	TAT 7409	8,550.00	
62	Matos Transport Service	TAP 1882	6,300.00	
63	Anand Maharaj		7,200.00	
64	Lauren C. Moore	TAZ 9594	9,350.00	
65	Ram & Nar Contractors Limited	TBK 231, TBK 732, TBG 8092, TBJ 4286	212,232.75	1,242.00
66	Peter Nelson	TAM 1904	34,800.00	
67	Ivan O'garro	TAY 1010	8,525.00	

68	Plant Engineer and Maintenance Service Limited	TAD 8259, TAE 2088, TAE 9894	76,417.50	16,500.00
69	Martin Pierre	PAT 4417	21,000.00	8,628.99
70	Neeyanlal Persad	TAG 4226, TBM 7558	3,000.00	1,094.23
71	Ronnie Phillip	TAZ 8173	12,600.00	8,333.09
72	Leo Phillip	TBW 4785	26,100.00	
73	Ellis Rodney	TAH 8208	48,000.00	
74	Junior Ramsahai & Son	TAH 6421, TAC 3106, TAG 2310, TBE 2348, TAU 350, TAP 7753	12,650.00	2,686.68
75	Chanderdath Ramnath	TZ 2814, TX 7468, TW 7209	88,320.00	
76	Mukesh Ramnarine	TY 5855, TW 2785	90,875.00	10,000.00
77	Arthur Roberts	TAG 3125	6,300.00	
78	Ellis Reid	TAD 2245	26,450.00	
79	Harold Ramsawak		11,088.00	
80	Felix Roberts	TBM 7618	30,600.00	
81	Motilal Ramhit & Sons Contracting Limited	TBL 981, TBE 1257, TBC 7856, TAH 3487, TAG 3970, TBL 980, TBL 982, TAY 1935 - 6	22,770.00	21,381.75

NO.	NAME OF SUPPLIER	VEHICLE #	AMOUNT PAID	AMOUNT OWING
82	Calvin Stephens		4,800.00	
83	Amersh Subhanie		5,400.00	
84	R.S. Services Limited		3,000.00	
85	Pirtie Ramnarine Singh	TAK 4769	10,150.00	
86	Jagroop Sumir	TAZ 5688	5,500.00	22.94
87	Junior Valley	TBB 6708	9,225.00	
88	Neil Walcott	TAH 3715	7,225.00	
89	Neil Walters		20,400.00	
90	Ian White		8,600.00	5,911.58
91	Peter A. Yearwood		3,544.66	
TOTAL			3,760,026.79	388,336.05

**Consultants/Advisors
(Costs and Procedures)**

79. Mr. Chandresh Sharma asked the Minister of Planning and Development:

Could the Minister furnish the House with a list of:

All Consultants/Advisors employed and/or contracted by the Government in 2002 indicating the original contract sum as well as the actual amount of monies paid to these Consultants/Advisors; the procedures employed in the hiring and/or contracting of Consultants/Advisors?

The Minister of Planning and Development (Hon. Dr. Keith Rowley): The Government is responsible for the following portfolio:-

Economic Planning, Development and Monitoring

National Human Development

National Manpower Planning

National Statistics

Public Sector Investment Programme

Population
 Technical Co-operation – Projects and Programmes
 Town and Country Planning
 Urban Development
 Statutory Boards and Other Bodies
 Advisory Town Planning Panel
 National Population Council
 Chaguaramas Development Authority
 UDeCOTT

The Ministry of Planning and Development has engaged the services of the following Advisers on contract in 2002 at the following rates of remuneration:

POSITION	NAME	MONTHLY SALARY	TRANSPORT ALLOWANCE
Adviser to the Honourable Minister	Dr. Vincent Moe	13,000.00	1,200.00
Legal Adviser	Ms. Cleopatra Crawford	9,500.00	1,400.00

Procedures Employed

The Adviser to the Minister was engaged on contract by the previous Administration as an Adviser to the former Minister of Environment. Following the expiry of his earlier contract as adviser to the former Minister, he was engaged on contract for a further term as Adviser to the Minister of Planning and Development. The Legal Adviser was engaged originally through the process of advertisement and competitive interviews.

UDeCOTT has employed the consultants listed in the attached table. The original contract sums as well as the actual amount of monies paid to the respective consultants is also listed.

Procedures Employed

The hiring and/or contracting of the Consultants/Advisors by UDeCOTT is undertaken on the following basis:

Experience and track record

Consultants are utilised where work to be performed is of a highly specialised and professional nature and for which internal resources do not have the time, necessary skill or specific work experience. Furthermore, employing such skills permanently is not practical given the term nature of the undertaking. In such cases UDeCOTT's selection is based primarily on the track record, work experience and qualification of the firm or individual.

Qualification and professionalism

Other key criteria for selection are capacity to perform within a timely manner and experience in similar undertaking. UDeCOTT's consultants are selected by reference to:

Education and training

Accreditation by professional associations and bodies

Past service and delivery

UDeCOTT's consultants are required to provide a level of service that meets international standards. Consultants are therefore selected who have delivered in the past on time, within budget with the highest level of quality control.

Value for money

Each contract for the provision of services is vetted and analysed to ensure that the requisite value is obtained for the expenditure incurred. Professional bodies tend to be guided by a fee structure which is referred to during our evaluation of terms of reference. All contracts executed are at or below that scale."

**Multi-lateral Funding Organizations
(Negotiations)**

82. Mr. Ganga Singh (*Caroni East*) asked the Minister of Planning and Development

Could the Minister inform this House whether negotiations are currently being undertaken by the Government with the following multi-lateral funding organizations:

The World Bank;

The Inter American Development Bank (IDB);

The European Investment Bank;

The Caribbean Development Bank?

- (b) If the answer to (a) is in the affirmative could the Minister state the quantum and purpose of the loans or proposed loans?

The Minister of Planning and Development (Hon. Dr. Keith Rowley): The information requested on loan negotiations currently being undertaken (Pipeline Loans) is as follows:

“PIPELINE LOANS CURRENTLY BEING PURSUED BY THE GORTT”

PIPELINE LOANS CURRENTLY BEING PURSUED BY THE GORTT

Organisation: Project/Programme	Quantum of loan	Purpose of loan /Components	
World Bank: HIV Aids Prevention and Control Project Total Cost US \$25m	US \$20m	The purpose of the loan is to assist the GORTT in the prevention, treatment and control of the HIV Aids virus in Trinidad and Tobago. The proposed components are: refurbishing of the Queen’s Park Clinical Center (QPCC); conditioning of the hospitals in Port of Spain and San Fernando, as well as other facilities throughout the country;	Support for research activities, that focus on operational aspects, support for the implementation of monitoring and evaluation guidelines, strengthening of the present procurement arrangements as well as procurement alternatives such as OECS.

Organisation: Project/Programme	Quantum of loan	Purpose of loan /Components	
		<p>expansion of laboratory capacity of public health laboratories and selected public facilities serving as referral centers for the diagnosis and treatment of HIV/AIDS;</p> <p>support for training of staff for prevention and clinical management, and training in skills.</p> <p>development of a strategy for the scaling up of treatment activities, including the definition of referral and support arrangements among a network of selected facilities throughout the country and in Tobago.</p>	<p>Support the syndromic management approach toward universal coverage, expansion of the directly observed treatment strategy (DOTS) with respect to tuberculosis.</p> <p>Adopted by the GORTT; identify and bridge gaps in the information system in order to ensure the appropriate nationwide surveillance of the epidemic and laboratory and clinical services in coordination with CAREC</p>
Inter American Development Bank:			
Trade Sector Support Programme		The objectives of the programme are to:	Status

Organisation: Project/Programme	Quantum of loan	Purpose of loan /Components	
Total cost \$7.2 m	US \$5m	<p>Improve institutional organization of the Ministry of Trade and Industry (MTI);</p> <p>Develop the technical capacity of human resources in trade-related public institutions;</p> <p>Improve the technical, analytical and institutional bases of trade policymaking;</p> <p>Provide support to the private sector's attempts to adjust to the challenges posed by liberalization of trading arrangements.</p>	The Loan Agreement has been vetted by the Attorney General for signing by the Minister of Planning and Development.
<p>Inter American Development Bank:</p> <p>Land Administration Programme</p>	To be determined	The Bank's assistance has been sought for the design preparation and financing of a new Land Administration programme which will serve to build on the reforms initiated under the Investment Sector Reform Programme and the	The overall objective of the programme is to create a more vibrant and efficient land market, so as to release the potential of land tenure for poverty reduction and environmental sustainability.

Organisation: Project/Programme	Quantum of loan	Purpose of loan /Components	
		Agriculture Sector Reform Programme in the legal framework for land administration.	
South West Tobago <u>Environmental and Waste Water Project</u>	To be determined	To address the problem of environmental pollution of South west Tobago, in particular from waste water Programme components: Facilities Component, including the Collection, Treatment, and Disposal of Wastewater in South West Tobago (the Facility) and water source optimization, the rehabilitation of the Hillsboro Dam, and ways to increase utilization of the existing Scarborough wastewater treatment plant.	Coastal Zone Management Initiatives, including: a Master Plan for the Coastal Management of Tobago; Public awareness and education; Research and Development; Watershed management; Building a base line for coastal management; Capacity building, including strengthening the Environmental Management Authority; addressing Charlottesville and Speyside environmental issues; and an enforcement and regulatory framework for waste disposal from ships which may

Organisation: Project/Programme	Quantum of loan	Purpose of loan /Components	
		Water provision, which will include the rehabilitation of the Hillsboro Dam and water source optimisation.	include a waste disposal facility. Base studies for Strengthening the Water Sector and to support project preparation, including: a review and compilation of past studies to reform the Water and Sanitation Sector, including the Corporatization of WASA, new tariff structures and possible forms of private sector participation; Strengthening the Regulated Industries Commission (RIC); and a focus training program for operating and maintaining wastewater facilities.
<u>Public Administration Transformation Programme</u>	To be determined	To strengthen the capability of the Public Sector to contribute to the achievement of the	A non-reimbursable Technical Co-operation (grant) Programme is

Organisation: Project/Programme	Quantum of loan	Purpose of loan /Components	
		goal of achieving developed country status.	currently being prepared. The major output of the TC Programme is an operational plan or road map, which could form the basis of a strategic approach to the implementation of the horizontal and vertical reforms required to meet the objectives of a modernized Public Sector, including Human Resource Management, Civil Service Regulations and procedures, Financial Management, Information Technology, Procurement etc.
European Investment Bank: No loan programmes under consideration .			
Caribbean Development Bank: Development		To provide Technical Assistance for the preparation of:	final designs for the rehabilitation of all campus sites, other

Organisation: Project/Programme	Quantum of loan	Purpose of loan /Components	
Master Plan for the COSTAATT (College of Science Technology and Applied Arts of TT) Total Cost US\$1.305m	US \$1m	a Development Master Plan for COSTAATT, including services for Tobago a physical development programme for all campus sites, with costs preliminary estimates of costs for construction of the central campus; and	than the central campus. The loan has been approved by the CDB. The Agreement is being vetted by the AG.

Meteorological Services

86. Dr. Adesh Nanan (*Tabaquite*) asked the Minister of Public Utilities and the Environment:

Would the Minister provide a list of the names of the members of staff and the positions they hold at the Meteorological Services?

The Minister of Public Utilities and the Environment (Sen. The Hon. Rennie Dumas): There are 54 monthly paid and one daily paid on staff at the Meteorological Services Division. Their names and positions are provided in the following table:

Name	Substantive Post	Acting
Eli Henry	Director	Pre-retirement leave
Willis Mills	Assistant Director	Director
Glendell De Souza	Meteorologist IV	Assistant Director
Emmanuel Moolchan	Meteorologist III	Meteorologist IV
Marlon Noel	Meteorologist II	Meteorologist III
Shakeer Baig	Meteorologist II	
Shelley James	Meteorologist II	

Name	Substantive Post	Acting
Arlene Aaron	Meteorologist II	
Saide Shakeer	Meteorologist II	
Joanna Sooknanan	Meteorologist II	
David Gajadhar	Meteorologist I	Meteorological Supervisor (CAST)
Ezekiel Sampson	Meteorologist I	Climatologist
Bagwandeem Ramdatt	Meteorologist I	
Nazim Mohammed	Meteorological Equipment Repair Supervisor	
Ronald Cassie	Meteorological Equipment Repairman	
Alison Lakhiram	Meteorological Equipment Repairman	
Ramjit Redoy	Senior Meteorological Assistant	
Keith Joseph	Senior Meteorological Assistant	No-pay leave (Tax Appeal Board)
Gary Benjamin	Senior Meteorological Assistant	
Krishna Brijmohansingh	Meteorological Assistant	
Francis Sutton	Meteorological Assistant	Meteorological Equipment Repairman (CAST)
Bryan Thomas	Meteorological Assistant	Training for Meteorologist II
Debra Joseph	Meteorological Assistant	Probation Officer I
Christopher St Clair	Meteorological Assistant	Meteorological Equipment Repairman

Name	Substantive Post	Acting
Fariied Khan	Meteorological Assistant	
Arnold Ramgoolam	Meteorological Assistant	Training for Meteorologist I
Carol Subrath-Ali	Meteorological Assistant	Training for Meteorologist II
Oscar Lovell	Meteorological Assistant	
Deryck Dhanie	Meteorological Assistant	
Roddy Moonoo	Meteorological Assistant	
Nisha Ali	Meteorological Assistant	
Ashford Dickson	Meteorological Assistant	
Alemu Riley	Meteorological Assistant	
Paula Balkaran	Meteorological Assistant	
Carolyn Corrian	Meteorological Assistant	
Kaidar Kissoon	Meteorological Assistant	
Soogrim Sagar	Meteorological Assistant	Engineering Scholarship
Akil Nancoo	Meteorological Assistant	Training for Meteorologist II
Geeta Persad	Meteorological Assistant	
Ian Persad	Meteorological Assistant	
Candi Hosein	Temporary Meteorological Assistant	
Josiah Hudlin	Temporary Meteorological Assistant	
Anton Wiltshire	Temporary Meteorological Assistant	
Aaron Maharaj	Temporary Meteorological Assistant	

Name	Substantive Post	Acting
Kiran Sedoo	Temporary Meteorological Assistant	
Lynette Gopaul	Administrative Officer II	
Angela Mahabir	Temp. Clerk/Stenographer II (Science, Technology & Tertiary Education)	Clerk/Stenographer III
Charmaine Rosalle	Clerk/Stenographer II (Science, Technology & Tertiary Education)	Clerk/Stenographer III
Rashena Ali	Accounting Assistant	Auditing Assistant (Ministry of Finance)
Vindra Siewdass	Clerk I	
Venessa Singh	Temporary Clerk I	
Janelle Alexander	Temporary Clerk I	
Kirk Fouchong	Chauffeur/Messenger	
Margaret Richards	Office Attendant	
Nankishore Deonarine	Labourer	Daily-paid